AMERICAN WOMANHOOD

ARMY MEDICAL LIBRARY
FOUNDED 1836

WASHINGTON, D.C.

"OUR HOME ON THE HILLSIDE"

AMERICAN WOMANHOOD:

ITS

Peculiarities and Necessities.

BY

JAMES C. JACKSON, M. D.,

PHYSICIAN-IN-CHIEF

OF

"OUR HOME ON THE HILL-SIDE,"

AND AUTHOR OF

'HOW TO TREAT THE SICK WITHOUT MEDICINE," "CONSUMPTION—HOW TO PREVENT AND HOW TO CURE IT," "THE SEXUAL ORGANISM AND ITS HEALTHFUL MANAGEMENT," AND VARIOUS OTHER POPULAR BOOKS ON HEALTH.

"Give her of the fruit of her hands,
And let her own works praise her in the gates."

PROVERBS.

Second Edition.

AUSTIN, JACKSON & CO., PUBLISHERS,

DANSVILLE, LIVINGSTON CO., N. Y.

MASON, BAKER & PRATT, 142 & 144 GRAND ST., NEW YORK.

Annex
HQ
1206
J132
1870

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1870, by
AUSTIN, JACKSON & CO.,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the Northern
District of New York.

EDWARD O. JENKINS,
PRINTER AND STEREOTYPER,
20 North William Street, N. Y.

Dedication.

To my Beloved Wife,

Who, during the forty years of our marriage,
Hath done me good and not evil;
Who hath girded her loins with strength,
And made strength and honor her clothing;
Who hath looked well to the ways of her household,
And eaten not the bread of idleness;
Who hath opened her mouth for the dumb,
And reached forth her hands to the needy;
Whose children rise up and call her blessed;
And the crowning glory of whose life is,
That, in her old age, she has come to be
An advocate of Suffrage for Woman;

I Dedicate this Book.

JAMES C. JACKSON.

Maple Beach, N. Y.
April, 1870.

426752

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I. PAGE

A Peculiar Type 7

CHAPTER II.

Physical Organization 12

CHAPTER III.

Unhealthy Foods 20

CHAPTER IV.

Unhealthy Drinks 25

CHAPTER V.

Unhealthy Dress 32

CHAPTER VI.

Constrained Locomotion 40

CHAPTER VII.

The Useful and Beautiful in Dress 52

CHAPTER VIII.

Life In-doors 62

CHAPTER IX.

Marriage; or, Women who Can and Do make Good Wives and Good Mothers 72

CHAPTER X.

Non-Maternity; or, Women who Can and Do make Good Wives, but do Not make Good Mothers..... 81

CHAPTER XI.

Women who do Not make Good Wives, but Do make Good Mothers..... 94

CHAPTER XII.

Women who, as Society goes, can Neither make Good Wives nor Mothers..... 105

CHAPTER XIII.

Competency of this Class of Women..... 123

CHAPTER XIV.

Their Business Capacities..... 140

CHAPTER XV.

The Ballot..... 150

AMERICAN WOMANHOOD.

CHAPTER I.

A PECULIAR TYPE.

The American woman is a new or original type of womanhood. In no other country, nor in any other age, has the like of her ever been seen. Born and reared under nominally free institutions, her characteristics simulate largely those of Liberty. In the combinations of her Vital Forces, therefore, she is widely separate from the woman of the ancient or modern Asiatic or European civilization. Justice to her forbids comparison with either of those types of womanhood. Substantially, she stands alone; and if brought alongside of them, it should be in the way of contrast, not of comparison. If she is to be measured in order to be made to take proper place in scale or rank, it must be done by reference to archetypal forms.

As it is the tendency of Liberty, when dealing with Vital Organisms, to create original forms, and make them all the more beautiful, enduring, and productive, as they are developed under Freedom; so to the de-

gree that the women of the Republic of the United States have been permitted to enjoy freedom have they been benefited thereby. On the other hand, to the degree that they have apparently enjoyed Liberty, while in reality they have been deprived of her sustaining influence, have they been injured.

Liberty is a constituent element in the nature of all beings, who are so organized by their Creator as to be able to become *self-governed*. To draw the line between those who are and those who are not thus organized, so as to discriminate with exactitude, one must go into the sphere of Organic Law, and make examination of first principles. What, then, always and everywhere enters into the constitution of creatures fitted for self-government? Clearly, this one quality—of being capable to understand Right from Wrong, and of choosing between them. Whoever has this Organic or constitutional faculty has a natural capability for Liberty, and thereby has a natural right to enjoy her.

Much as American men have learned to prize Liberty for themselves, and have come to see and feel how vitally necessary to a well-developed manhood she is, in politics, in religion, in business, and in government, they have, as yet, failed to understand how much woman, in these regards, needs her presence and her power. As a consequence, they have only in small measure apprehended how much woman has suffered and does still suffer, in her innermost and outermost nature, from want of association and communion with

her. While they themselves, quite early in life instinctively, and later in life from reflection, come to feel that they can get on after the best manner in no direction unless inspired and sustained by Liberty, the placing of woman, in relation to the uses of her powers and the performance of her duties, where she may partake of Divine Inspirations and share in the great benignities and blessings of Liberty, seems to have commended itself to their judgments and their moral sense only in the dimmest manner.

This is very derogatory to American civilization, whether viewed from the point of Christianity or of National Policy, and is highly censurable; for, to have Society and Government confessedly organized on principles of Liberty, and have them illustrated and enforced by a policy which permits to one half of the adult population only, the benefits which flow from their application, is very selfish and quite unmanly. This is all the truer because Liberty, of right, belongs equally to all *persons:* and if difference is to be observed as between them, it must grow out of, and for its justification depend on, their different degrees of aptness to make her of practical service to themselves individually. To recognise woman as personal, and hold her responsible to Law for her personal conduct, while she is in any direction deprived of her personal liberty in the shaping and fashioning of that conduct, injures her greatly; it both debases and degrades her. The ill effects of such a course are scarcely less deplorable in their reflex than in their direct bearings Man

is injured by it scarcely less than woman; for, since no human being can afford to deprive himself of freedom, he cannot afford to deprive others of it.

The American woman is far removed from the ancient Greek, Roman, and Jewish woman, as well as from the modern European woman, characteristically as follows:

1. In the style of her physical organization, which *physiologically* demands for her the largest bodily freedom.

2. In the organized combination of her intellectual faculties, which demand for her, thorough recognition of her personal worth, accomplished education, and full use of her powers for her personal benefit.

3. In the quality and measure of her spiritual endowments, which demand for her, recognition of her personal worthiness and intellectual force in the family, in society, in the Church, and in the State.

Together, these make her so unlike the women of other times and of other countries, that to institute relations for her in any of the departments of active life, in view of what was good or is now good for *them*, is to do her gross injustice—in fact, is to outrage her nature. Standing by herself, she must be considered by herself; and her relations to life, both in the department of rights and duties, should be adjusted to what she is and to what she may be, and not in view of what other women have been or are. I can readily conceive that the Greek, the Roman, or the Jewish woman, of the age in which their respective Nationalities were at

their hight of power and splendor, considered from the point of development, was not ill considered or badly treated. The Greek matron was a brood-mare, the Roman matron a suckling she-wolf, the Jewish matron a human slave. They serve, however, as staple samples of the womanhood by which the American woman is habitually invited to adjust her own, and for not doing which she is severely criticised. Her critics make the mistake of supposing that the earth rolls from east to west, and knowledge is to be found in perfection only in the Past; whereas, whoever would make the greatest attainments in knowledge, and in liberty to use it, must, whether man or woman, fix eye on the Future. Better for the American woman to study the archetypal woman than a Greek statue or the woman of History, would she learn woman's worth, find her sphere, or accomplish her destiny.

CHAPTER II.

PHYSICAL ORGANIZATION.

In considering her peculiarities and necessities, let us look at her physical organization—her bodily form. This seems to be needful, because, without doing so we cannot understand her character, and failing in this, we cannot define her appropriate sphere. The science of Human Life is as essentially inductive as any physical science. To understand it properly, one must reason from facts to principles, from phenomena which are visible, to laws which are hidden, insomuch that it may be justly said that we cannot have a sound and reliable Psychology, or Science of Life, except as we have scientific Physiology, or true knowledge of the laws of the human body.

To know how to deal with a human soul one must understand it, and to do this, one must know the peculiarities as well as general qualities of its physical organization.

In what consists the peculiarities of the physical organization of the American woman, which make her unlike all preceding or contemporary types of womanhood?

(*a.*) *In the relative size of that portion of her brain in front of her ears to that portion back of her ears.*

Science has determinately settled the fact that the cerebrum or frontal brain in the human creature is the seat of thought, both perceptive and reflective. Man does not think with his liver, or his stomach, his kidneys, or his bowels, his hands or his feet, nor does he think with or by means of his cerebellum, or back brain. His thoughts originate in, because his mental faculties are located in, that portion of the large brain situated in the fore part of the skull. With his back brain, or that portion of the brain situated in the back of the head, low down, he *feels* and puts his feelings into forms of motion. Knock one on the back of his head and you may paralyze his legs so he cannot walk, while he may think clearly and consecutively. Strike him a blow on his forehead and you may destroy all power of consecutive thought, and yet leave him able to walk firmly. As a matter of fact, therefore, in relation to active life and manifestation of responsible character, other things being equal, two persons will show different styles or forms of bodily build and mental characteristics in the ratio of the difference in size and manner of conformation of their frontal and back brain. Take two women: the ancient Greek and the American woman of to-day. Measure their heads minutely and you will find substantially the following differences: Around the head, from front to rear, in largest part, Greek 20½ inches; American 21¾ inches. From the orifice of the ear on one side over the skull just above the eyebrows to the orifice of the other ear, Greek 12¼ inches; American 13⅓ inches.

From the orifice of one ear over the top of the head to the other orifice, Greek 14¾; American 16 inches. From the orifice of one ear on a line with the orifice backward round the head to the orifice on the other ear and on a line with it, Greek 13¼ inches; American 12 inches. These differences in size of their respective heads, considered each as a whole, and of the frontal brain of each to its back brain, make up for each, bodily and mental conformation and characteristics peculiar to itself, and widely different from the other; so much so, that it will not do to compare them. They can be justly examined only by contrast. Take mankind from the Creation to the commencement of the Christian Era, and the Greek woman of the period of the highest Grecian civilization is not so far removed from the woman of the lowest savage or barbaric life, in any or all of her physical qualities or characteristics, as is the American woman of to-day removed from the Grecian woman of the period of the highest Greek civilization.

(*b.*) *In the relative size of her brain-nervous system to that of her organic or nutritive-nervous system.*

I know of no Nationality whose women show so small a difference in measurement around the head, from front to rear — the tape passing just above the ears; and around the waist — the tape passing around the body, at the pit of the stomach — as do American women. It is not uncommon to find American women whose heads will measure 21½, 21¾ to 22 inches, whose waists will not measure more than 23 to 25 inches over the clothes.

Such persons, when in their ordinary health, often do not weigh more than 98 pounds, and only a few can be found who ever overgo 125 pounds. I have examined the heads of over 8,000 American women, resident in over twenty of the States of the Republic, and their average size of heads was 21½ inches, their average size of waists, dressed, was 24¼ inches, their average weights 110 pounds, their ages ranging from 19 to 52 years. I have examined the heads of thousands of foreign-born women, and found only here and there one whose head would measure over 21 inches, while not one in a hundred could I find whose waist would not measure, dressed, 29 inches. Allowing for the space taken up by the dress 3 inches in each class, and the relative size of head around its largest part, and the body about the waist, was as follows:

American woman—head 21½ inches, waist (3 inches being allowed for clothing) 21¼ inches; making the head ¼ inch larger round than the waist.

Foreign-born woman—head 21 inches, waist (3 inches being allowed for clothes) 26 inches, waist being larger than head 5 inches. These statistics have not been gathered to support a theory, but to arrive at facts, in whose light conclusions might be safely deduced, and scientific principles established. Thus collated, they go to show that the American woman has already come, or is rapidly coming to have defective or abnormal style of build, and is being organized into a new or original type — unlike any seen before her time, or now existing out of the United States of America. By means of the

influence over her of the civil, political, and religious institutions under which she is born, and which impose upon her and fix her conditions of life, she is developing into two varieties — the light-haired, blue-eyed, thin-skinned, very pale-faced, under-sized, light-weighted, sprightly-acting, vivacious species; and the black-haired, black-eyed, thick-skinned, swarthy, broad-browed, large-faced class — the two absorbing the hazel-eyed, gray-eyed, brown-haired, ruddy-cheeked type. Outside of the foreign-born class, or their progeny, there are not to be found, in proportion to the whole number, one-fourth as many red-haired, dark brown-haired, red-cheeked young or middle-aged women, as could be found in this country forty years ago. Making all due allowance for climatic influences, and the effects of aliments used and beverages drunk, I am compelled to conclude that these peculiar developments are mainly to be attributed to the wide diffusion of knowledge whose general benefits the American woman gets, and to her deprivation in large degree of handicraft labor. I say *deprivation*, because while woman has had awarded to her the right, the privilege and the duty of domestic labor, she has never had accorded to her the right to select and follow mechanical pursuits. Society, through Public Opinion, and the State, through legislative enactments in times past, have hedged up her way, so that she has had no natural outlet for her powers except in the narrowest and most confined manner. Inasmuch, however, as she must grow — and not having freedom to grow symmetrical — she has gradually developed a

form of body that is "*sui generis*," of the like of which neither Science nor History makes mention.

Viewed in any light, it is greatly to be regretted that so powerful a drift has been already constitutionally given in a wrong direction to the exercise of Vital Energy in the American woman, because it will be hard work to recover right position. Do the very best we all may, it will take a long time to reconstruct the Womanhood of the Nation, so that its female progeny shall be what, in such a climate and country and under free institutions, women ought to be. If the best that might be done is not done, then it needs not the vision of a prophet to foresee that the children to be born of American women will have but little of which to boast, but much to mourn over in lack of constitutional power of endurance and of physical beauty.

(*c.*) *In the relative size of her head to her whole body.*

It is a law of organic or structural physiology that the human body, to be made after its true model, must have a large cerebellum or back brain, and which dips down low into the nape of the neck, as it were. If this structural formation is greatly lacking in any given subject, to the extent that it is, will the person lack organic or constitutional power to grow symmetrical and strong. If, in addition to this lack of size of back-brain, there is undue-size (relative to the size of the whole body) of the cerebrum, or front and top brain, the difficulty of normal development of the whole body is increased. In every such case, some of the following forms of deviation from the true anatomical or architectural line of build will be noticeable:

1st. In too long and too small neck.

2nd. In low, stooping, slanting shoulders, with the shoulder-blades often standing out like wings.

3rd. In flattened position of the breast-bone, or its opposite — the chicken-breasted formation.

4th. In unduly developed mammary glands early in life, with almost entire disappearance of them in later years.

5th. In very small, and therefore very feebly organized, digestive organs, especially the stomach and lacteals.

6th. In feeble procreative capacity, or if otherwise, in feeble health consequent on child-bearing.

7th. In large bones and small muscles, or in small bones and excess of fatty tissue.

8th. In legs too short for the trunk of the body, or in body too short for the legs.

9th. In arms too long for the body or disproportionally short to the legs.

10th. In hands large and fingers blunt at the ends and set wide apart.

11th. In feet set on the legs so as to turn in, making their possessor pigeon-toed.

12th. In legs so set on to the body as to give to their owner when walking an eccentric movement, making the gait ungraceful, or, if graceful, wanting in power.

Now, putting together the facts which I have stated above, it is not difficult to see why American women—native born—are so keenly intellectual, so sharply intuitional. so actively social, generally speaking so early

marriageable; why they have uniformly poor health, have their beauty rapidly fade, and why they die early; being in many respects unlike the foreign-born women of the republic, who, becoming residents here after adult growth, are benefited in many ways by the physical and social changes to which they are introduced.

It is quite pertinent, and may be profitable to inquire into the causes which have wrought so wide departure from their ancestral build, as the present generation of American women shows. Of physical causes may be mentioned:

(*a.*) Unhealthy food.
(*b.*) Unhealthy drinks.
(*c.*) Unhealthy dress.
(*d.*) Constrained locomotion.
(*e.*) Confinement in houses.
(*f.*) Too frequent child-bearing.

I will consider them in order.

CHAPTER III.

UNHEALTHY FOODS.

With us, as a people, bread and meat constitute the staff of our life, being eminently the staples of our food. Of the grain used, wheat ranks all the other grains in quantity used, as it does all of them in natural fitness. According to Liebig, Bousingault, and other chemists, 107 parts of wheat are equal to 111 parts of rye, 117 of oats, 130 of barley, 138 of Indian corn, 177 of rice, 894 of potatoes and 1,335 of turnips. In making bread out of wheat after the form or manner which with us is almost universal, certainly quite common, we greatly deteriorate it, insomuch as to make it less nutritious than it might be; but not only so, we make it noxious, thus disturbing those who eat it in many instances, by causing severe irritation of their gastric nerves. In preparing wheat for cooking, the uniform practice is to separate the bran from the flour. When this is done an analysis of these will show the harm of bolting. The principal solid constituents of the human body are fat, bone and muscle. I offer the following condensation of facts taken from a statement of a scientific gentleman, correspondent of one

of the ablest and oldest papers in the State of New York.*

1. *The fat.*—Of this ingredient, 1000 lbs. of whole grain contribute 38 lbs.; fine flour 20 lbs.; bran, 60 lbs.

So that the bran is much richer in furnishing the materials of fat than the interior portion of the grain, and the whole grain ground together is richer than the finer part of the flour, in proportion of nearly one-half.

2. *The Muscular Matter.*—One thousand pounds of whole grain, and of the fine flour, contain of muscular matter respectively—whole grain, 156 lbs.; fine flour 130 lbs.

So that of the material out of which the animal muscle is to be formed, the whole-meal or grain of wheat contains one-fifth more than the finest flour. For maintaining muscular strength, therefore, it must be more valuable in an equal proportion.

3. *Bone material and Saline Matter.*—One thousand pounds of bran, whole-meal and fine flour contain respectively—bran, 700 lbs.; whole-meal 170 lbs.; fine flour, 69 lbs.

So that in regard to this important part of our food, necessary to all living animals, but especially to the young during their growth, the whole meal is three times more nourishing than the fine flour.

Taking the three essential elements of a nutritive food thus existing in wheat, and comparing their respective amounts in the whole-meal and in the fine flour, we find that, on the whole, the former is one-half more valuable for fulfilling all the purposes of nutrition than the fine flour. "It will not be denied," says Pro-

* Country Gentleman, Albany, N. Y., Luther, Tucker & Co.

fessor Johnson, "that it is for a wise purpose that the Deity has so intimately associated in the grain the several substances which are necessary for the complete nutrition of animal bodies. The above considerations show how unwise we are in attempting to undo this natural collocation of materials. To please the eye and the palate, we sift out a less generally nutritive food; and to make up for what we have removed, experience teaches us to have recourse to animal food of various descriptions. It is interesting to remark, even in apparently trivial things, how all nature is full of compensating processes. We give our servants household bread, while we live on the finest of the wheat ourselves. The mistress eats that which pleases the eye more—the maid, what sustains and nourishes the body better."

It has been found, by Majendie and others, that animals died in a few weeks when fed only upon fine flour, but lived long upon whole bread. Thus, the coarse bread given to prisoners is the best they could have; for, being restricted from all other food, there would not be sufficient nutriment in fine white loaves to sustain life for any length of time. The nutritive properties of bran are exhibited in its effects in fattening pigs and other animals; and thus, this apparently woody and useless material is found to produce valuable results.

In eating starch, or fine flour bread in so large quantities as they do, American women construct defective bones, a worse thing than which, organically regarded, it would be difficult for them to do. In the formation of a model body, nature always pays close attention to the construction of bones. They are to the other parts what the hull is to a vessel complete. Masts, sails, rig-

ging are little worth when the frame or body of a ship is defective in build. So with the human body. No woman, however full and round in muscle and smooth in outline, can have hardiness of body if she has brittle bones. They indicate lack of endurance. If under strain they break easily, whatever may be urged to the contrary, she, under heavy taxation, breaks down easily. Life's trials wreck her. Strong bones cannot be made out of *starch;* and superfine flour has more of this than of any other substance in it. Starch, when introduced into the stomach and from thence onward into the intestines, readily is converted into sugar, and thus serves an excellent purpose as heat-forming food; but sugar does not make bone, nor does starch nor sugar make muscle, or sinew, or nerve. White, leavened, wheat bread never should be eaten as a staple food. Because it is, it can readily be discerned why so many cases of deformed bony structure exist. Of any number of American girls over sixteen, and of American women over thirty years of age, a large percentage will be found to have the right shoulder lower than the left when measured with exactness; and whenever this is the case the ankle of the left leg will be found to be crooked. In not a few families this has come to be a transmitted deformity, the mothers carrying it over to their children.

Of meats, it may be said, that they are eaten by American women far too freely. Were those who make use of them persons of lymphatic temperament, the ill effects would be less observable; or, being of

the temperaments which for the most part American women show, if they lived out of doors more, and had plenty of exercise in the sunshine and pure air, there would less injury accrue to their health and their organic forces than now takes place. As it is, the animal food eaten by them does not make muscle in large amount, nor does it construct nerve in great measure; but it does make a quality of blood which excites the brain, heart, and lungs, increasing their activity, and thereby developing a large measure of power. If food has what some physiologists call "potential energy," assuming that flesh-meats have this quality in them, they are not good food for American women when used by them as *staples*, because the conditions of living which are ordinary with them do not require this sort of energy. Situated as they are "from cradle to cross, and from footstool to throne," they have already too much innervation. They are always on the alert. They eat quickly, talk rapidly, walk too fast, read too much, sleep too little, pass girlhood too soon, and become old too early. A great many of them are constitutionally infecund, or, if not absolutely so, are only feebly procreative. They do not need stimulation, but do need sedation. Their vital energy ought not to be aroused and made to take on extraordinary vigor; but, instead, it should be quieted and kept below its ordinary level. Otherwise, in some shape, structural departure from the true order of bodily growth will show itself.

CHAPTER IV.

UNHEALTHY DRINKS.

The only fluid fit to be habitually used as drink is living, soft water. It is "God's only beverage" for man. It only can answer absolutely the purposes for which a living human body wants a solvent. Compounded with anything else, it loses usefulness exactly in the ratio that this is done. Any other substance mingled with it, by infusion or solution, deteriorates it and lessens its quality. All the mineral waters of America and Europe are unhealthy to drink. Ten thousand times as many persons have been injured by them as were ever helped. Here and there an invalid, made so by retention in the body of some earthy salt in excess, is made better by drinking water which holds in solution another earthy salt, having strong chemical affinity for the one in the invalid's blood. So when these two come together and union takes place, a third or neutral salt is formed, which is innoxious, and relief is had, and the patient gets better. But no such result follows the use of mineral waters, in the great majority of cases where persons drink them. Nervous, excitable, irritable, irascible, extremely wakeful, super-active women should not use them. To the blood of such

persons they are as destructive as "Munn's Elixir," though in quite a different way.

If, then, waters which are called mineral are not good to drink, water which is called pure, yet has in it a solution of carbonate of lime, is also unfit to use habitually as a beverage or common drink. Almost all the water in the wells attached to dwelling-houses is hard. Such ought not to be used by women built after the physical structure common to American women. Some of my readers may think me quite finical, but I am not. Vegetables and animals never thrive when compelled to use hard water as a drink (for vegetables drink as truly as animals), as they do when they have soft water to satisfy their thirst. The leaves of the vegetable put on a sickly pale-green look, and the hair of the animal stands out staringly and dry. No human muscle is as elastic and enduring when the person wearing it uses hard, as when soft water is used; nor are the nerves as electrically or magnetically charged; the bones and sinews are not as strong; and the brain is never as healthy and enduringly vigorous. But the worst effects from its use are seen in the unhealthy action which the kidneys, bowels, and skin take on. Persons who habitually use hard water freely as a drink have constipated bowels, irritable bladders, and dry skins, with sweating feet. In instances not a few, have I seen the insensible perspiration conducted through the bottoms of the feet almost entirely, making the subject quite uncomfortable from their extreme moisture and the odor of them. In other instances I

have known persons to be made ill from the generally deranged action of the lymphatics, and these persons have been cured by the abandonment of hard, and the use of soft water in its stead as a drink. Very few women know anything about the healthful effects of drinking freely of pure soft water. It washes the blood, making it clean; it helps to dissolve worn-out tissues, whether of bone, muscle, or nerve; it assists in the formation of new structure; it tones the stomach, keeps aperient the bowels, promotes healthy action of the kidneys, and innervates the skin. Even the brain of a liberal and habitual soft-water drinker is healthier, more normal, and will work steadier than it is possible for it to do under the use of any other fluid. Notwithstanding these great advantages from its use, nine-tenths of all the women in this country do not habitually use it, and very few, comparatively speaking, use it exclusively. There are several orders, schools, and societies, large in numbers and strong in influence, existent in the United States, which have for their aim and object the disuse of alcoholic and other intoxicating drinks. In these associations are to be found large numbers of women who are intelligent, high-minded, and largely benevolent. For the most part, I doubt not, these are faithful to the vow they have taken; but, for their own highest good, they have not gone far enough. To do the best for themselves they can, they need to do more than pledge themselves to the disuse of intoxicating drinks; they should assume a positive position, and affirm a positive principle;

they should pledge themselves to the free and liberal use of pure, soft water. The human body not only does not need intoxicating fluids, but it does need, and in large quantities too, good water. No persons except Health Reformers are pledged to the use of water; and the consequence is, that this fluid as a drink has largely gone into disuse. In every contrivable way substitutes have been got up, of which there is not one that is not infinitely below it in all the constituents and uses for which fluid as a drink is needed and demanded by the human system. Not counting in the distilled, brewed, and vinous beverages, what other concoctions have we, in common use, whose influence has been extended and powerful in the production of the present abnormal, physical build of American women? We have—

TEA AND COFFEE.

In almost every house they are in use, whereas in every household, whose head and housekeeper as wife and mother, is a woman of sanguine-nervous, nervous-sanguine, or nervous-bilious temperament, they ought to be rigorously excluded. Their natural and legitimate effect on organisms thus constituted is to subject the nervous structures to excessive action and reaction, and so to destroy their integrity and stability. When this is done utter ruin stares the victim in the face; for what can a person do in a world like this, with such surroundings as American institutions give to American-born women, when her nerves are like untwisted flax

fibres, and her brain is like a ball of phosphorus? Neither tea nor coffee has nutrient elements. The most their warmest advocates claim for them — and at the head of this school stands Liebig — is, that used in moderation they have *staying* power, *i. e.* they check the metamorphosis of the tissues, and so sustain the system. "A poor pretense and a feeble virtue, this!" For it so happens that where such sudden and often violent suspension of organic activity is induced as must be in the case supposed, the worst reactions are imposed on the nervous structures. When the lymphatics, by reason of some unassimilated substance in the blood, are compelled to suspend action, and so excretion of waste matter ceases for the time being, where else shall the *vis vitæ* be sent except to the nervous centers and to the brain? 'Tis this that makes alcohol intoxicating. If it were not for this disturbed vital action in the lympathics, induced by its presence in the circulation, I doubt whether alcohol could intoxicate. It is because it checks, or in many cases for a while completely stops excretion, by causing change of tissue to stop by robbing it of its oxygen, that it makes him who takes it drunk. Were its presence in the blood, as this flows through the body, to cause no modification of vital action in any of the vital organs, or in any of the structures or elements of the body, no man could get intoxicated by its use. Just so is it with tea and coffee. The exhilarations they cause to the women who habitually use them are in the ratio of the disturbance of the vital force they cause. Both are nervines and seda-

tives. Both are sedatives and depressants, and neither a nervine nor a sedative nor a depressant can be a tonic. No person can extract tone out of tea or coffee. "Tone, medically speaking, is the strength and activity of the organs from which proceed healthy functions." These substances cannot impart strength, and when their presence in the blood induces activity or develops strength, it is always done at an ultimate loss. There is such a process as expending strength to be made the stronger thereby; but this always is done by adding to the actual or possible energy of the nutritive organs. Whosoever evokes strength from his body and gives nothing back, sooner or later brings on bankruptcy; and this is what, in large numbers, American-born women have been and are doing. They are making themselves devoid of vital resources, and are adding to the calamity by giving to the children they bear very feeble constitutions.

Not a few persons perhaps who may read what I have said of the tendencies of unhealthy drinks, as well as of their direct effects in producing the abnormal build common to American-born women, may think my reasoning far-fetched. If so, I differ from them, because from the closest observation and thoroughest reflection, I have come to believe that the constant use of mineral waters, lime water, tea and coffee, or of brewed and vinous liquors, by our American-born women, has a great deal to do, in conjunction with their other abnormal habits of life, in producing their excessive development of nervous structure, and of

activity of such structure at the expense of the muscular and bony tissues of their bodies, and to their own personal loss in health, position, usefulness and character.

Is it a small matter whether a woman shall be strong or weak, enduring or with little or no staying power of body? whether she have good common sense or is greatly lacking in it? whether she be capable of large and broad culture, or competent only to the comprehension and practical application of the ceremonies and conventions of life? whether she prove competent to the duties of wife and mother, or not? When in the advanced stage of this discussion it comes to be seen how large a proportion of American-born women has already developed radical unfitness for domestic life not only, but for every kind of life that involves the exercise of large reason, resolute will, continuity of purpose, and bodily vigor, my thought as to their peculiarities and necessities may appear more substantial.

CHAPTER V.

UNHEALTHY DRESS.

Of causes purely physical which have induced amongst American women a wide departure from their ancestral ability, is the wearing from generation to generation of an unphysiological dress. Viewed in detail, it readily appears how bad the fashion is.

First. They have uniformly worn their hair done up with combs, pins, or knots on the *back* of the head.

This tends to produce, and in uncountable cases does produce, congestion of the cerebellum or back-brain. From this congested condition arises, in a great many instances, diseases of the organs of nutrition and excretion; and when a woman becomes pregnant, it either induces or directly tends to induce modifications of the structural or organic conformation of the offspring. It is one of the laws of nature that where the habits or methods of life of the female are such as to induce functional disease on herself when she is not in a child-bearing state, such habits, when she is in such state, directly tend to produce organic or constitutional disease in her offspring. Wearing the hair done up on the back of the head, therefore, has made American women give birth to a great many malformed as well

as a great many feebly-organized children. Since the practice of wearing waterfalls has come into fashion, this evil result to offspring is likely to be much increased. The only natural way of wearing the hair is in the flowing style, unless it be regarded also as natural to cut it off. Under the present conditions of general life common to civilized peoples, it would be very inconvenient to wear it flowing over the shoulders; and out of this inconvenience has grown the practice or habit of doing it up on the back of the head. This, in effect, makes the hair short; so that as far as appearance from length is concerned it might as well be cut off; and so far as the question of health is worthy of consideration, it would be incalculably better that it should be worn short.

Second. Women uniformly wear upon their heads unhealthy covering. Were they to go without any they would do a great deal better; for then nature would set herself to work to supply a sufficient amount of blood to the integuments of the head, and thereby increase and thicken up the natural covering—the hair. In truth, there is no better way whereby to increase the thickness of the hair by growth than to wear nothing on the head. If one, however, will wear covering on the head, it should be of such a nature as to secure as equal circulation as possible. Under the present habits of American women, however, with reference to head-covering, there is no such condition of the circulation insured; but on the contrary, and almost unavoidably, a disturbed condition is established; for such

is the power of Fashion over them, that in many instances they go, within a twelvemonth, two or three times between the extremes of wearing little or nothing and wearing thick covering on their heads. All this has very much to do with the magnetic or electrical condition of their nervous systems; and this has much to do, not only with their general bodily health, but with their intellectual vigor.

Passing from the head, we come

Thirdly, to the way in which women dress the *upper* part of the body, or that portion usually denominated the chest. Herein they show a complete inappreciation of the value of the laws pertaining to life and health. As the lungs are vital organs, holding very high rank in the animal economy, and therefore entitled to great consideration if health and life are of much worth; to dress in such a way as seriously to interfere with them, is not only to outrage nature, but to insure sooner or later her uttermost penalties. In no direction, save one which I shall mention by and by, do women show themselves to be so entirely devoid of right perception, or of large appreciation of their needs, as in the fitting of their costumes to the chest. It is a law of nature that whenever, in the exercise of a vital function, interference is had so as seriously to impede or disturb such function, substitutive efforts shall be made. To illustrate: if from any cause the blood which goes through veins is interfered with by the cutting off and taking up a vein so as to break the connection, nature immediately forces the blood back to the heart through other

channels, making good by a round-about way, as far as she can, the original condition. So it is in the direction of action of the lungs. Whenever, from external pressure, arising from any cause, the circulation of the blood is impeded, nature forces it into the deep blood-vessels and piles it up there, impelling it along by increased action of the heart. The lungs, which are organized to hold great quantities of blood at a given time, are thus compelled, in order to meet the necessities of the case, to dilate the coats of their blood-vessels, so as to hold at any given moment a much larger quantity of blood than would be necessary if the circulation were undisturbed throughout all parts of the body. When congestion ensues, oftentimes irritation, attended by cough, follows; and where this is not relieved, inflammation is established, suppuration ensues, and so abscess is formed, thus creating pulmonary consumption. All pressure, therefore, upon the lungs, from whatever cause, is directly calculated to induce disease of these organs. In my practice I have probably had, first and last, not less than five thousand women who have come to be examined for diseases of the lungs, of whom quite a proportion were in such a state as to render it out of the question for me to do them any good, they being thoroughly incurable. Yet of them all I believe there were not a dozen who were not dressed so tightly about the lungs as in the course of time to insure pulmonary disease to any woman or man, however healthy, had such person been subjected to the constant wearing of just such a dress as these

poor creatures wore at the time they sought relief at my hands.

Fourth. Another point in the way of wearing unhealthy dress is that of wearing it tight around that part of the body commonly called the waist—the part wherein the stomach is enclosed. It is a curious fact, and very significant, that of all the persons who die of consumption of the lungs in this country, seven-eighths of them, probably, have the disease originate in derangement of the stomach. Dyspepsia is the forerunner of pulmonary disease. Of the fruitful causes of dyspepsia in its varied forms, perhaps none is more common than that arising from external pressure of clothing upon the stomach. Almost all American women so dress as to have belts or girdles pass around the body right over the stomach, contracting it, and hindering it from any thing like natural motion. In order to digest food, the stomach has to contract and expand. If you contract it so that it cannot expand, you hinder it from performing its natural office of dissolving food and preparing it to pass out of that receptacle into the organs further along the alimentary canal. Any external pressure which will in the least degree interfere with the office of the stomach in disintegrating and decomposing the food, tends directly to produce indigestion. A great many persons are made dyspeptics without understanding the cause. They have silently undergone permanent contraction of the stomach so that it is not competent to hold food enough to keep the system in conditions of health. A human stomach can

be made to contract so that its natural capacity to hold food can be lessened from one-half to two-thirds. Add to this, that by such contraction its power to digest what it *can* hold is very sensibly and seriously diminished, and you can get at the reason why there are so many persons suffering from dyspepsia. Where there is one man in this country suffering from dyspepsia, there are probably five women; and this, too, notwithstanding the general dietetic and drinking habits of men are much more unhygienic than those of women. This is attributable, amongst other causes, to the very bad practice common to American women of girting or belting their bodies so as to force the stomach to contract. Out of this condition of things one may get a glimpse of one of the reasons why I advocate an unbelted or basquine style of dress for women. The contraction of the stomach produced by girting the waist of the body is not the only evil which results therefrom to the person who does it. Right behind the stomach lies a net-work of nerves, called by physiologists the solar plexus; so named because in its conformation it appears like the sun, the nerves radiating and passing off in many directions as from a common centre. Pressure upon the stomach affects this net-work and produces irritation, which directly causes in many instances that nervous condition known as hysteria. Perhaps there is no more powerful cause for the production of this disease than organic nervous irritation induced by tight dressing. Whoever has had to do with a woman suffering from hysteria knows what

a terrible infliction upon her, and scarcely less upon all who have to do with her, the disease is. It is one of the most difficult to manage; puts on almost protean changes; controls will, sensibility, and physical action; making the person suffering from it at all times unreliable and in many instances unmanageable while the paroxysm lasts.

Fifth. Wearing dresses, as most women do, tight about their waists, is a powerfully provoking cause of a class of diseases known in polite phrase as Female Ailments. Very few American women can be found over twenty-five years of age, whether married or unmarried, who are not suffering from some form or phase of uterine difficulty. The reason why the disease has come to be so common is, first, because of the constitutional feebleness of our women, and their want of general good health; and second, because of their styles of dress, which induce mechanical displacements of the organs contained in the abdomen and pelvic cavity. When a belt is habitually worn round a human body, over or just below the stomach, sufficiently tight to produce sensible pressure, the stomach not only shrinks and permanently contracts, as I have before said, making the person smaller around the waist than she naturally would be, but the bowels also shrink to get away from the pressure. The abdominal muscles lose their contractility, and let the intestines sink into the lower part of the abdomen. In their fall they press upon those organs which lie below them, and are situated in the pelvic cavity.

A woman suffering from any one of these forms of mechanical displacement, becomes physically enfeebled. She cannot walk, nor work, nor sit up straight, nor lift weights with any degree of comfort. Life becomes an uncomfortable burden to her.

CHAPTER VI.

CONSTRAINED LOCOMOTION.

The right so to use one's body as to be able to move from place to place to the best advantage, is one of the most sacred rights of man. It may be regarded as a central right around which the entire group of rights revolve. Arrange a person's relations to life in such way as that the right of locomotion is denied, and you have substantially spoiled the intrinsic worth of all the other rights which may be said to belong to him. There can be no more degrading slavery to a human being than to have denied to him the free use of his bodily powers, whereby he shall pursue his own happiness after his own idea of it, without molestation or hindrance; except where it is manifestly clear that such person is disqualified by want of reason or want of purpose to use his rights within their own legitimate precincts. The day has been in the history of civilization when it could be said of woman that she was not competent to take care of herself, and therefore society and government were not only at liberty, but were bound to take care of her; but in the United States of America this can with no propriety be said. American women are so intelligent, so enlightened, so Christianized, and there-

fore so civilized, that they are competent to maintain, and therefore to come into possession of, and enjoy, their own rights. If it be true that under European civilization and its governmental institutions, women are not sufficiently developed to be clothed with full franchise, and freedom of their own powers, it is not true of American women. Liberty has done her proper work for them as decidedly and as efficaciously as it has for American men, though not to the same extent; because society and government have not been willing to allow to women the education that they have to men. Nevertheless, the reflex influences of liberty on American women have been of so developing a nature that they are a great way in advance of any other nationality of women in the world. They therefore are entitled to all the protection society can give, to all the authority of custom and the force of fashion in the way of freedom of use of their locomotive forces. They should be as free to go from place to place in the pursuit of their own happiness as American men are. They therefore should be entitled to dress themselves in such way as will enable them to do this to advantage rather than at disadvantage. To recognize them as citizens of the state — as members of a just social economy which has for its guidance and leadership the great spirit of liberty, and yet constantly to appear related to them as though they were mere serfs or slaves, is to do foul outrage to all the sensibilities of their natures, and to make just the severest criticism warranted by the facts of the case. I know it is said that the difference between men and

women is such as to justify a difference in style of dress. Admitting the correctness of this view, it does not follow that in order to make the difference readily perceptible, woman's dress needs to be *unphysiological;* for all that would be necessary in the direction of difference in style, in order to make plain the difference in sex, would be the wearing of different badges; the men wearing something on their clothing which should indicate their sex, and the women wearing something in or upon their clothing which should indicate their sex. This might be done as readily by a breast-pin, by a hat or cap, by collar or cuff, as by skirts; so that it does not follow that in order to have sex recognized and acknowledged and properly protected, the apparel which women wear should be destructive of their physical powers, and of their health, and so of their character. When the right of the thing comes into issue, and discussion follows, the result will have to be, that where men and women are substantially alike in organization, they shall be entitled substantially to the same uses of organization. A man's eyes are no more his own for purposes of vision than are a woman's her own. His hands are no more his than her hands are hers. Her right to maintain good health by the sustaining power of good food is as positive as his is. Wherever she has faculties like his in organization and order of use, she is as thoroughly and clearly entitled to their use, and to all the results which properly follow therefrom, as he is. Now, in the structure of that portion of the human body usually termed the legs, women are built anatomi-

cally and physiologically upon the same principles that men are. If a man wishes under the exercise of his organs of locomotion to move himself from one place to another, the means by which he puts his propelling powers at work, and the way in which they become actively efficient, are the same as those by which a woman must put hers whenever she attempts to go from one place to another. In this respect God has made the man and the woman alike; therefore their right to the use of their powers in this respect is alike. They may be said then to hold the right in common. Neither society, nor the church, nor the state is at liberty to impose restraint or restriction on the one more than on the other. When either does it, giving liberty to one and debarring liberty from the other, it commits an outrage on the person whom it restrains. It gives a monopoly of liberty and creates a special privilege for the one, and plays the despot to the other, and seeks to make her a slave. No community can, without committing crime, trench upon the abstract right of any woman to the full enjoyment of her powers whenever by proper qualifications she shall be in natural relations to their use. It makes no difference what the right is which inheres in the person. It is complete as a possessory right, and it is complete in the person as an enjoyable right, when she is competent in the development of her own powers to the use of it.

The dress of the American woman is open to criticism and severe censure in the following respects. It is unhealthy, unhandy and unhandsome. The first point I

have already discussed. The dress of the American woman is unhandy in two ways: 1st, in the constraint it puts on the arms. This is observable in the fact that from the way the sleeves are set into the waistcoat, great restriction is imposed on the motion of the arms. They are, as it were, tied down. In certain directions one who wears a dress fitting the body tightly, as for the most part women do, and whose sleeves are set into the waistcoat low on the shoulders, cannot raise her hands and arms without difficulty and at great disadvantage.

Free motion is impossible. Between her and a man who has free motion of his arms, there is wide difference, and, of course, great distance, which, through life in all departments of labor requiring strength, activity and expertness for success, his freedom constantly increases, and which her restraint renders it impossible for her to overcome. This hindrance on her becomes all the more observable when one comes to study the various handicrafts followed by our American men, and notice how intimately connected skill of the hands is with free use of the arms. I have for years studied patiently this point, and I am satisfied that there are over two hundred kinds of work which men follow, and thrive thereby, that no woman can take up and successfully compete with them in, while she wears tight waists and sleeves set low on the shoulders. Many of these arts can only be followed by persons who are skilled in the labor needful to be done, and this skill is obtainable only by great patience of effort, under which the will trains the muscles of the

arms and fingers to the most delicate sensibilities. This training cannot be given where hindrance to free action exists. So absolutely true is this, that many mechanics are compelled to take off their out-of-door or outside clothing, whenever they begin work. An unreflecting person seeing one of them do this, would conclude that he did it to make himself more comfortable; but the truth is, *a necessity is on him.* He must do it, or he either will fail to do what he does satisfactorily, or he will fail in the amount he ought to do. Skilled labor in America is coming to be supreme ruler. It is rising in dignity and, of consequence, in importance, yearly. I can remember when a farmer was despised, and a mechanic was a clodpate; when manual labor was degrading, and "the upper crust" in society was the class of consumers. That day in this country went to its setting with American Slavery. It was a period, when it culminated, of great degradation, wherein labor suffered untold cruelties and honest industry underwent martyrdom; for he who earned his bread was less respected than he who cheated for it. But liberty helped labor, and labor rewarded liberty; and now and for evermore in this Republic they travel hand in hand. If women are to be henceforth the representatives of labor, they must take service under liberty. If they are to become skillful in work, they must be free to work; or else to them will be committed the least important and least remunerative employments. If, however, one may justly complain of their half manacled hands, what criticism or reproof

is too sharp or too severe on their voluntarily enfettered legs? How can a creature so nobly endowed as woman is, thus willingly impose, or submit to have imposed, conditions upon her, that at the very outset take one half her worth away? Can she not see that, take the world with its innumerable interests, demanding the use of vast resources under wisely directed intelligence, made available through a vast variety of forms of skilled labor, it would be utterly impossible for these interests to be properly cared for, and so successfully promoted, by those men now having them in charge, were they all to be compelled to put off pantaloons and put on petticoats? Business in ten thousand forms would have to come to a stand-still. The whole machinery of modern civilization would have to be remodeled, and if done, when done would represent weakness instead of power. Instability, irregularity and indetermination, would characterize all movements designed to secure and mark human progress. Given time enough to work out legitimate results, the prevailing aspect of the new regimen would be incapacity. How many centuries have rolled away during which millions on millions of laboring men, in order to reach present results, have been tasked to death because the manner and method of their work were crude and lacking in contrivance. Now, however, a new day has come. Never before was the genius of man so wrought upon to invent skillful instruments for the saving of human labor; never was it so liberally rewarded with success.

Put every man on earth into petticoats, and keep them on him, and God's "sunshine would go back on the world's dial," till the blackness of darkness would completely cover its face. By so much, then, as the world would recede in all that involves its present and future good, were its men-workers to become trammelled in the use of their bodily powers as women always have been and now are, by so much has it always been kept from progressing in having woman fettered as she now is. Because, take all the pursuits, avocations, professions, and interests, which have their origin in, and their dependence upon human labor, examine them closely and classify them carefully, and it will be found that nine-tenths of them are as entirely within the natural physical competency of woman as of man to manage expertly. Then why does she not occupy and fill her full share of them? For the reason that *of her own free will* she consents to be made, or makes herself, *physically* incompetent. She deliberately consents to place her bodily powers where, in relation to use, they can be exercised only at disadvantage, while man as deliberately and no less strenuously asserts and maintains his right to put his bodily powers to their best use at the greatest possible advantage. The moral effects of these different determinations on these respective parties, it is impossible fully to calculate. On woman it is enslaving, degrading, debasing. It weakens her body, makes her mind impracticable and her genius torpid. It makes her satisfied with show and sham, and unwilling to struggle for high realizations.

She is content with business relations and duties that are monotonous, and is willing to commit to others her highest personal interests. To hold personal position, have accorded to her individuality, be recognized as self-supporting, does not come within her ambition. The construers of the Gospel; the interpreters of law; the expounders of constitutions; the organizers of public opinion, hitherto have conspired to make her believe that in thus foreswearing her freedom, and foregoing all efforts to enjoy it, and in putting on and wearing everywhere, like an enforced convict, a dress that indicates unmistakably her apostasy from freedom and the dignity of labor, she is giving the clearest evidences of her true appreciation of womanhood. So long as she does, or can be made to believe this falsehood and act under it, man will be her superior and govern and control the world, though she were to vote a dozen ballots to his one. In America, opinion is the governing power, and opinion depends on intelligence, and this on knowledge *how* to do, quite as much as *what* to do. In matters of commerce, *having* a vote cannot tell a woman *how* to vote so as to promote commercial interests. She must know; if she does not, she is dependent on the opinions of those who do know. If all the merchants are *men*, then in the sphere of commerce they are the masters, and the women are in *that* sphere their inferiors. As in commerce, so in every business, every art, every profession, every trade; those who understand its laws and are masters of its details, in this country regulate and fix its conditions. If woman

is to be the equal of man, she must know as much as he does. In order to do this, she must be as free to acquire and apply knowledge as he is, and to do this she must remove all obstructions, overcome all obstacles, put away all hindrances not only, but she must rid herself of every symbol, emblem, type, and insignia indicative of her inferiority.

I hold it to be philosophically impossible, and, therefore, practically absurd to try, to elevate a class or portion of a people who have long held inferior conditions and positions, and have been compelled or induced to wear *badges* indicative of their inferiority, unless such symbols are put away. Forms have wonderful power. They incorporate, under certain circumstances, into themselves intense significance; and if there be a necessity for changing conditions which the forms illustrate, represent, and make common to human consciousness, it is of fundamental importance that in attempting to change such conditions, the forms whereby these are represented should first be changed. Under the laws of progress, involving improvement and culture of human beings, it will be found to be a fact, that as all the relations of human life are made to take on imposing, substantial, permanent conditions by means of symbols or forms representing them, whoever sets himself up for a reformer will be under the necessity of instituting new forms in order to represent new ideas or new relations. Thus, when Christ came into the world and laid the axe at the root of the tree, amongst the very first things that He did in His effort to sup-

plant Judaism by Christianity, was that of relieving His disciples from the obligations to fulfill Jewish ritualism. He went so far in this respect as to exonerate them from one of the most important of all their religious ceremonials—that of keeping the seventh day according to the Mosaic commandment. When He was taken to task therefor, He distinctly and clearly affirmed not only his right to do it, but the necessity for doing it in order to institute a new social regimen; and for His justification of it He declared that the Son of man was Lord of the Sabbath day. I doubt very much whether Christianity could have been introduced amongst the Jews, if the forms of Jewish worship had been continued. The spirit of Christianity could not be confined within the limit of Judaistic formulas. Had He sought to do this He would have choked His philosophy to death in the very attempt to give it birth. So it is in other respects. Take our American civilization. We cannot keep it up in this country unless we have forms of government to represent the idea. A democracy in idea could not exist on this continent for half a century under a monarchial form of government. The idea would perish by strangulation, under such form. Just so in our American life. An American citizen who has imbibed the spirit of liberty until the rights of man, as represented in his own person, have come to be very sacred with him—have come to hold in his view not merely a political, but a manly significance, could not consent to live, without earnest protest, under a government which sustained caste and

class legislation. To be content, he must have citizenship, where the element of equality can constantly have in his own life illustration of its power and worth.

In America, society, which always forms opinion, and government, which seeks to enforce it, have done much to keep woman down. The rights which are hers they deny to her; the privileges and immunities which as a human being belong to her are not accorded to her. In order that they may the more successfully keep her down, they agree to create and make forcible a public sentiment which shall forbid her, at the risk of her reputation, to wear any other style of dress than that which, in its very conformation, subjects her to do everything which she undertakes to do at great disadvantage, and, therefore, which necessarily places her in the direction of the thing to be done in the condition of inferiority to man, who is not compelled to do the same thing or things at a disadvantage. As a consequence, her dress is the symbol or emblem whereby her inferiority is shown. It makes clear to everybody who sees it on her, or her in it, that she is in a state of vassalage; that as yet she is not free; that she is in a state of serfdom; that she is, after the fashion suited to the civilization of the nineteenth century, a serf—affixed to the soil; that her right to go from one place to another is not accorded to her. Will she always accept the situation? Time will tell.

CHAPTER VII.

THE USEFUL AND BEAUTIFUL IN DRESS.

Dress may properly be considered under two aspects—the Useful and the Beautiful. The majority of American women are so situated, that they ought first to consider the useful in dress. In failing to do this, and making the beautiful to take front rank, they do themselves great injury, and subject themselves to great injustice. They not only destroy their health, but they pervert taste. God has made the human soul to love beautiful things; it is one of its instincts to do so. From its exercise have grown the Fine Arts—poetry, painting, architecture, sculpture, and music. Of these, painting and sculpture have had the most to do with the development of styles and fashions of dress; because they have sought to give ideal representations of the human form, and so have had either to adopt for it the covering in vogue, or to rise into the sphere of the ideal, and invent or create styles.

It is worthy of notice, that Art, through painting and sculpture—as far as it has made attempts to elaborate styles of dress which it could defend on the score of beauty or utility, or both, has uniformly acted on

the theory that style should comprise the following points:

1. It should always fit the form wearing it, or so approximate thereto as to be decidedly *suggestive*, thus aiding the imagination to awaken consciousness to the facts of the case. 2. Necessarily, it should play a subordinate part to the person wearing it. 3. It should be made of proper material.

I readily admit that beauty in dress may lie in the illusions which it creates, as thoroughly as in the elaborations which it educes. The illusions, however, should be such only to the sense. The imagination should be able readily to penetrate the veil, and make good by its power what the eye fails to comprehend, or there can be no conception of beauty. Dress a human body so that the eye can form no judgment, and the imagination no conception of its shape, and at once all knowledge whether it is beautiful or not is at an end. Dress it so that the knowledge of its form shall be exact, or, the knowledge being deficient, the imagination may exert itself to make the defect good, and ideas relating to beauty immediately arise in the mind. Thus fitness becomes an element of beauty; this principle obtains absolutely. To dress a horse as one would an ox, a dog as one would a monkey, to make an ass wear a lion's skin, or a goose a peacock's tail, would violate all sense of fitness in cultivated minds. In each case the organization asks for that aid, if rendered at all, which will by means of covering, whether natural or artificial, bring into relief points in the structure

which might otherwise be overlooked. Till attention is called by their absence, one does not know how intimately the tail and ears of a horse are related in developing beauty in other portions of his body. To crop a horse's ears is to deform him to that degree that nothing but the cropping of his tail also, can hide the deformity. To diverge from the law of structure of the horse in the ideal, so as to have him have large ears on a small head, and his tail set low down, is to diminish his beauty of form so much as to make it impossible for a good judge to pronounce him handsome, though in other respects he is faultless. Exchange the heads of the horse and ox, or their tails, and you will have spoiled the beauty of both. So in other things: give the ox the horse's legs, or the horse the ox's legs, and you have defeated the aim and end of the architect, not only as regards utility, but also as respects the sense of beauty in the human mind.

As the beautiful in living organizations increases in delicacy as well as in strength, as these rise in the scale of being, it may be said to reach its highest degree in the Human. The body of man or woman is the most beautiful of living forms. It is vitalized in larger measure than any other, by the source of all life, and stands erect in the Divine presence, the master of them all. How ought, then, the human body to be dressed? Most evidently in no way to deform it, nor to lead to misconceptions of its actual structure, nor to injure its power. As in the general outline the bodies of man and woman are alike, whoever argues that Art is but

a method of conforming to Nature in an expression of her creations, can reasonably urge that the dress of the sexes may properly be similar in style. For instance: dress should as strictly conform to the body it covers in the case of woman as in that of man. It should show her general shape as it should his. It should develop her more artistic structure as truly as it should his. It should bring out her personal charms, should minister to her health and to personal comfort, as truly as to his. It should allow of displays of strength in her case as in his; and by all the laws of true taste and the rules of art, it needs to differ from his only suggestively, and, to meet the demands of the most fastidious, only sufficiently to avouch her sex. In adults, except in lands where women go veiled, this need not be done; for Nature has set her own signet on the face, proclaiming the difference of sex by the beard. When man shall rise above the contemptible farce and sorry effeminacy of shaving, for the purpose of distinguishing sex, full-grown men and women might dress alike. The beard, to say nothing of other differences obvious to all close observers, would proclaim the line of separation. The voice in conversation, in singing, or in elocution, would bespeak the difference. I do not thus call attention to these differences which delineate the sexes, for the purpose of urging that man and woman should dress alike, but to show that woman should so apparel herself as not to hide from view such outlines of her structure as are essential to the formation of a just judgment of her personal appearance.

To dress her neck in as ill taste as man does would be very foolish. By collars and kerchiefs he makes his neck—which Nature, in her model-man, builds small and sets his head to elegantly—as large and bungling as possible. A very silly and very wicked habit it is, and not infrequently visited by serious consequences. For woman to array her person so that, when dressed, she should appear at the loins as large as at the shoulders, and around the stomach as large as at the breast, thus destroying the curves in her form on which much of her personal beauty depends, would be in bad taste. To do her hair up in a wad at the back of her head is very unartistic, to say nothing of its unhealthiness. To comb her hair over her ears is to create a deformity not less disgusting than that of the Chinese, who force their feet into the worst of ill shapes. It may be said in man's praise, that whatever faultiness in style he has shown in dress, it lies in directions opposite to those which woman has usually shown. Men have never yet consented to adopt a fashion or style of dress that concealed their legs. They have consented to dress the trunk of the body and the head ungracefully, but the legs and arms, for the most part, they have ever so endued as to have them free for natural uses. Men have always known that the secondary sources of personal beauty, suggested by attitudes, postures, movements, and manifestations of strength by the body, are dependent on the arms and legs. One's admiration and respect for a person are measured very much by his attitudes. We watch how such a man stands

(that is, what is the relative position his legs hold to his body when he stands); what he does with his hands and arms when he sits; how he postures himself—whether with grace, and ease, and good-breeding, or with awkwardness; if the former, we speak in his praise, and say that he is a man of good-manners; if he is awkward, we pronounce him a boor. Our judgment forms our estimate of him by means of the way in which he puts to use his organs of prehension and of locomotion.

It is, however, not only in the attitude of repose that we judge of personal beauty. It is quite as much by the motion of the body as by its repose, that we decide, and conclude. The poetry of life is its poetry of motion. The gestures of the orator, the sylph-like movements of the dancer, the evolutions of power of the gymnast, the speed of the racer, the strength and vigor of the wrestler, the grace and ease of motion of the pedestrian, all aid us in determining the question of personal beauty. To show just what I mean, and to what extent by her present style of dress, which conceals her lower limbs, woman outrages the beautiful which God has wrapped up in her form, and which He put there expressly to be seen and so add to his glory, allow me to conduct you to a parade-ground. On it are five hundred men, dressed in military costume, but without glittering ornaments. The style is the modern, which quite nearly fits the body; the coat is single-breasted, with straight collar, so as to show the neck; has close sleeves, so as to give the outline of the arm;

fits the chest, so as to give to all the curves full expression; and leaves the legs and feet in full relief. Arrange these men in single file ready for motion. Now take the same number of women, dressed as women usually dress and place them also in single file. At the words, "Forward! March!" set both bodies in motion and watch them as they deploy. In looking at the men as they pass by, you will find them elaborating for you almost every element of beauty of which the human body is the receptacle. The swing of the arms, the posture of the head, the movements of the legs, especially from the knee downward, so that you get the bend of the knee at the time the leg is thrown forward; the movement of the foot as the leg is lifted, and placed at rest; the ease and grace with which the legs support the body, and with which the body rests upon them; the evident subordination under which within the limits of motion, the will of each man holds his body; the concert of action among the whole number; all combine to make the whole company inspire one with delight. But feelings and impressions of a far different kind are uppermost in the observer, at the sight of the women in motion. The two relate themselves to him differently. The men impress him with a sense of their personal qualities; the women with a sense of their personal clothing. The two, also, and this purely by their different styles of dress, require different standpoints for observation. A human being dressed so as to give one full view of the legs, suffers from no point of observation if his body is well formed; whereas, one

dressed like women of the present day, cannot without loss, sustain other than a posterior view. When a woman, dressed in long skirts, passes by a looker-on, or is seen coming toward him, her appearance is not pleasing. So true is this, that without effort, and only from an instinctive desire to get the most pleasure in the sight, men place themselves in the rear of women when they are walking. The face, hands, arms, legs, feet, in fact the whole body, confer grace when they are in motion. They all assist when in motion toward expression of power, and power after its kind is always character.

I would have, therefore, the dress of women comprise, as essential characteristics, three qualities. First, the quality of use. Second, of beauty. Third of use and beauty combined. When dress is worn so as to combine both the useful and the beautiful, it should possess both strength and niceness; but in every case should be put on simply, that is, should be put on and worn by each person, so as to insure as far as possible a concealment of defects of personal build, and heighten all personal graces and charms. By so doing it would often happen that where a defect was concealed, a grace would be made prominent. To do this, one needs to invoke due attention to color, fabric and drapery. It is a matter of regret to me that many persons who are earnest in the advocacy of change in woman's costume, are so strenuous in urging *simpleness* in dress. To wear short skirts and pantaloons, is with them the acme of reformation. This is a mistake. Failing to show delicacy and refinement in the arrangement of her clothing,

the Dress-Reformer fails to convince, and owing to the state of public opinion, can scarcely fail to outrage others. No earnestness nor devotion can compensate for this. Persons are not at liberty to be wanting in good taste, more than in good manners, because they love truth; and dress-reformers should not mistake simpleness which is weakness, or at best, want of power, for simplicity which is strength, or at least a means whereby to develop it. In the sphere of dress these two respectively type out failure and success.

The dress usually worn by women is open to criticism, because it forbids displays of personal strength. Men underrate strength as an element of beauty in woman, foolish creatures that they are. They have educated themselves to a liking for its opposite. A hardy, vigorous, tough-muscled woman, in the estimation of most men, betokens the amazon. They suspect her, are jealous of her, maybe are disgusted with her. The majority of men like women who have small hands, small feet, small heads, small waists, and fail to remember that, as a rule, these are more apt than otherwise, to indicate small intellectual and spiritual capacities. Everything about women that is small, men for the most part like. They think they like smallness because the æsthetic in them prompts to the liking; whereas nothing else prompts to it but their desire to maintain superiority, and the delight they feel in having with them those who, by reason of feebleness, remind them of their superiority, and the need of its exercise.

It would be becoming in men to educate themselves to a philosophy different from this. They would be nobler if they were to regard physical strength in woman with favor, and to look upon it as one means of developing in her beauty of person. If this is ever to be done, man must aid woman to form a public opinion which will justify her in clothing her body fitly. Physically she is now weak, and her dress symbolizes her condition. It may be said that it is a weak dress. Were man to adopt it, we would not say of him that he had become womanly; we should say of him that he had become unmanly. Man, therefore, should urge woman to change her dress — to wear one that represents ease, comfort, grace, fitness, so that these may become to her symbols of power. The freedom she will then have will increase her strength, the strength she will then have will add to her confidence, and from these will upshoot beautiful character.

CHAPTER VIII.

LIFE IN-DOORS.

"May never House, misnamed of Industry,
Make her a *captive*."

Domestic life with American women has a pretty ideal, but for the most part its realization with them is a drudgery. In the performance of its duties they violate nearly every law of Human Nature, and, as might be expected, serious ill consequences ensue. They lose health, vigor of mind, inspiration, genius, ambition, power to love. Their best qualities die for the want of culture, and from the same cause their worst qualities flourish. The soul is like the earth, only brambles, thistles and weeds grow therein spontaneously. Scientific tillage—Divine cultivation—is needed to produce *good* fruits. In this respect the American woman is sadly neglected, as I trust to be able to show most conclusively, when I come to speak particularly as to her spiritual needs.

It is susceptible of proof, I think, that on an average the American woman spends between birth and death seven-eighths of her time in-doors. Let us make a little

calculation about it. All night she stays in the house —whether her own or another's—whether in hall, concert-room, church, or school-room, matters not. She is in-doors—say, then—

For the darkness, ...	12 hours.
For meals—3 each day—1 hour each, .	3 "
For work, if she works, or for visiting if she does not work, or for receiving visitors if she does not visit, ...	6 "
Total in each day, . . .	21 hours.

This estimate is not overrated when the average of a woman's life is made up. For, during the years of childhood and growing girlhood, while she does not work she attends school, and her sessions are two of three hours each, or one of five hours in length. One need not be very wise nor far-sighted to draw conclusions as to the ill effects of such a condition of living on the health of those who are subjected to it, saying nothing just now of the effects on character. No animal organization below that of man could withstand deterioration under such abnormal interposition. Nor can woman's. The process of change goes on till constitutional modification takes place, and a new breed of human beings, born to suit the circumstances to which they are to be subjected, comes to exist. In this direction American civilization is false and must be changed, or organic deterioration follows as night follows day. Follows, do I say? It has already commenced; aye, has advanced to an alarming degree.

The truth is, in attempting to apply the principles of

the Gospel of Christ to woman in America, and lift her from the sphere of a slave, in which in other countries she was always and only a drudge, to a sphere where she should be a companion of man, we have as yet only permanently caused changes which have modified and qualified her vassalage. The changes which she has undergone in respect to her own former conditions have been so much only as has been conformable to the changes which she has made in relation to man; and these have kept strict bearing to those alterations which have been made in his relations to himself. As man has grown free, woman has grown free; but in all that pertains to a full development of her powers she is as far behind him to-day as she was behind him at the introduction of Christianity. To the degree that he is yet a "lord" is she his "vassal," owing him by marriage feudatory rights, and enjoying thereby vassal immunities. To what extent feudality exists in America between married persons or between fathers and grown up unmarried daughters, I do not care here to show. Facts easy to be got at exist and can be collated and made available. All I wish to say now is, that to whatever extent man has accorded to himself special privileges, to such extent is woman yet unenfranchised. As an instance that woman is yet to be delivered from thraldom and let into the light and liberty of the Gospel, and so take her place by the side of man and be his help meet, I cite the fact that unlike him she lives in the house, while he lives out of doors.

"Man can wander where he will, and breathe
The freshness of the valleys; he can let his blood
Struggle with frosty air, and winter snows,
And let the chartered wind that sweeps the heath
Beat his dark locks against his manly face.
He can be free of mountain solitudes,
And have around him, whether heard or not,
The pleasant melody of woodland birds.
Where and when he will, he can sit down
Beneath the trees, or on a grassy bank
Of high wayside, and with the little birds
Share his chance-gathered meal; and, finally,
As in the Eye of Nature he has lived
So in the Eye of Nature he can die."

Not so with woman. A great house is built for her, and she is put into it and is a prisoner. Her husband keeps her in it, lavishes his hard-earned wealth on her, spends for her gratification his inherited income, is devoted to her with undoubted and most faithful passion; but keeps her a prisoner.

"To her there is no Nature.
She has read of her in books, and dreamed
Of her; has painted on her fancy, wild woodlands,
And bright running streams, on whose green banks the deer
And moose do gather to lie down and ruminate.
She has heard of pigeons nesting in the tree-tops,
Of swallows gathering in the spring time,
From the far South, about the barn-eaves,
And with a pleasant twitter and a fluttering wing
Pairing themselves to build their homes anew.
She sits within her room whose frescoed walls and ceiling
Bespeak high art, and looks upon the thronged streets
Of city, or of town, and wonders what the world
May be which lies beyond her vision. Or, mayhap,

From out her window-opening she can see
Far in the distance the green fields, and wooded dells,
And winding gorges, to whose edge the farmer's plough
Has reached, and from whose skillful hand the rich grain
Has dropped at seed-time, by and by to ripen to the harvest.
But these are not for her. She is a child of Art;
And Art with us ne'er handmaids Nature.
When young she was a genius. God,
The Mighty and the Wise, had filled her soul
With yearnings after things imperishable.
By day He spake to her in sun and cloud
And changing sky. By night His voice
Sweet, soft, and holy, reached the deepest recesses
Of her soul, and tuned its chords to the divinest melodies.
To her his love had come unstintingly,
And many times, sleeping or waking, when alone,
Her spirit had received from Him new inspirations."

To such a woman a house to be shut up in for life is not a home. In the true sense, Home is a free place, a spot where not only Love resides, but where Liberty dwells as well. But change the scene. The house is not large. It is a cottage, and its owner is poor. Not the less is his wife a vassal and a prisoner. In the morning he rises and goes out to fill his lungs with air fresh and pure as that

"Which breezed through Eden."

His flagging powers take to themselves new vigor. Heart beats stronger, head feels clearer, limbs grow elastic, nerves begin to thrill, soul rises out of the dust and plumes itself for flight. The man advances into the foreground, the animal recedes into the darkness. To his body, to his soul, to his spirit, this stir at morn

ing dawn is like a new creation. Why should it not be? Life begets life, and life is all around him. Birds are opening their throats, and bees have begun their hum. Roosters crow from their perches, and hens cackle as they fly down therefrom. Calves bleat for breakfast, and their mothers low from love of them. Horses whinny in their stalls for food, and caper as they are led out to the watering. Think you this joyous outbreathing has no influence on him? Every nerve in his body feels it. It stimulates him, tones him, lifts him up to higher purposes, and makes of him a better and more competent man.

How with his wife? She dresses herself and washes her hands and face and begins her daily duties.

First, to get the breakfast under way.

Second, to dress the children.

Third, to set the table with dishes.

Fourth, to put the food on the table.

Fifth, to blow the horn or ring the bell, and then set the chairs round the table.

Sixth, seat the children, wait for the blessing if the husband is pious, and then serve him and then serve them, and then herself.

Seventh, after breakfast get the children off to school.

Eighth, get the victuals in way of preparation for dinner.

Ninth, wash the dishes that were dirtied at breakfast.

Tenth, look after the baking, the washing, or the ironing.

Eleventh, get dinner, serve her husband, and then herself.

Twelfth, wash dishes.

Thirteenth, churn.

Fourteenth, see company.

Fifteenth, get hot short-cake, butter, fruit-sauce and tea for them, or, if she has no company, mend clothes, darn stockings, and get supper for the family.

Sixteenth, wash the dishes, get the children off to bed and sit down to knit.

So the days go. One after another they pass, each coming in loaded with burdens which she has to lift and carry: each going out whispering as it goes,—"To-morrow and yet to-morrow shall be even as I have been."

My readers will perceive that the work which the laboring woman has to do in the house and for the family, subjects her to it, not for one day nor for one week, but for her life; and in doing so, enslaves her by degrading her to imprisonment. There is not a power nor faculty which does not undergo depreciation and deterioration by being subjected to long-continued exercise under such narrow circumstances. Of the work done I make no complaint in the abstract; but against the manner of doing it I do protest, and charge that, in all essential particulars it is an involuntary servitude, whose wickedness consists in that it is imposed on the innocent in the name of love, and is not at all necessary to the maintenance of a well-ordered family.

I cannot think of the conditions of living of my

countrywomen without pity and indignation commingled. Pity for them, that marriage, which in a Christian republic should be to them such a grand means of insuring happiness, serves largely no higher purpose than a lure, whereby they are in great numbers cheated of name, of fame, of home, of hope, of happiness, of health, of long life, and of well-developed character. Indignation I feel on their behalf, in that their husbands, fathers and brothers are stupider than unbroken donkeys, in respect to the terribly evil effects of such perpetual in-door confinement. There is no measurement of the evil attending it. Its hugeness defies calculation and well nigh awes opposition to silence. The passions of the worldly-minded and the prejudices of Christians are strong fortifications to the present family status, and he who proposes modifications or alterations or qualifications is likely to be looked upon as an innovator whose ulterior designs are destructive.

Yet at the risk of misapprehension, if so it must be, I declare the domestic life of American women as it exists on an average, unphysiological and so unhealthy, unpsychological and so immoral, unphilosophical and so wicked, and that every consideration which has in view the preservation of the family, its due development and the welfare of all its members, demands a thorough reformation in the conditions of living of women, so that they can have from childhood habitual life out of doors.

God never made human beings to live in houses. Houses should serve them, therefore, only for shelter

and protection. Daily—not weekly nor tri-weekly—life in the open air, is necessary for health to every human being. Man is so constituted, or organized, that he bears very essential relations to the planet on which he is born. He is of the earth—earthy. His physical conditions are better or worse as he bears a normal or abnormal relation to earth herself. Earth has her laws. These affect him whether he will or not. Every twenty-four hours she turns on her axis—making day and night. During this period the nervous system—both cerebro-spinal and organic—has to undergo a change involving action or expenditure of vitality, and reaction or gathering up of vitality. By daylight the nervous system is naturally related to the use of vital force. By darkness it accretes it.

Sleep is no more needful for man than it is for woman. Nor is sunlight less needful to woman than to man. She needs the appropriate agents whereby to give tone to her nervous system, while, under the activities of life, her strength is going out of her, as much as he does; and it is just as absurd to keep her shut up in a house and deprive her of sunlight, as it would be to keep man in the sunlight all the while and deprive him of sleep.

In order, therefore, that woman may have a healthy body she must have a vigorous nervous system, and for this she must have light—full and unshaded, habitually brought into use. She may maintain a moderate degree of bodily health and yet dwell in shaded light, but she cannot forego sunshine as she does in America, and

not suffer in the vigor of her cerebral brain. Judged as to her intellectual and psychological capacity she must always rank lower, far lower in the scale of power, than she would were her opportunities for life out of doors four-fold what they are at present. The question is, then, how can she get them?

CHAPTER IX.

MARRIAGE — OR WOMEN WHO CAN AND DO MAKE GOOD WIVES AND GOOD MOTHERS.

NATIVE-BORN American women as contra-distinguished from women of foreign birth, may, with reference to their domestic relations, be classified as follows:

1st. Those who can and do make good wives and good mothers.

2d. Those who can and do make good wives, but who cannot make good mothers.

3d. Those who cannot make good wives, but do make good mothers.

4th. Those who cannot make good wives nor good mothers.

During twenty years of large and varied professional medical practice, in which I have had opportunities to observe and study the characteristics of many thousands of my conntrywomen, I have come to the conclusion that the percentage of these classes rates substantially as follows; and I do not believe that any candid observer of the physiological and psychological conditions of native-born American women, is likely to come to conclusions widely different from mine.

Of class 1st, I count, say 30 per cent. Of class 2d,

25 per cent. Of class 3d, 20 per cent. Of class 4th, 25 per cent.

THE FIRST CLASS COMPRISES THOSE WHO CAN AND DO MAKE GOOD WIVES AND MOTHERS. They combine in their physical organizations and in their intellectual and moral faculties, those qualities out of which the highest form of the domestic relations grows. It may be said that they possess the highest and best combination of the organic forces that can belong to American women. Doubtless it is a misfortune to any woman that she is so constituted that she does not concentrate in herself the two very essential and important characteristics of good wifehood and motherhood. To be a good wife and a good mother, requires quite a peculiar and select order of forces.

The first requires of her good physical health, good social qualities, fair intellectual capacity, and large spirituality. The woman who is in feeble health cannot make as good a wife as though her health were good. Nor can she fulfill the duties of the wifely state with acceptance, if she is defective in her social forces. There are a great many women who in this respect are faulty; and it is a great fault. In this country it is coming to be a remarkable defect. Fortunately, however, the percentage of those who are competent to be good mothers only, is the smallest percentage with our native-born American women. The nature of our institutions demands of woman that she shall have the social characteristics largely developed. As things exist at present, the man is expected to occupy the more

actively laborious, and the more largely diversified sphere of operations. His business relations by and through which the family support is to be insured, are required to be much more extended and varied and complicated, than those of the wife.

As business goes with our people, of whatever kind it may be, success can only attend it when the person performing it gives it his personal oversight and personal interest. He needs to be absorbed in it, to devote himself to its performance and advancement assiduously, individualizing himself, and in a measure desocializing himself. He cannot give very much of his time nor of his personal consideration, to the evolvement and growth in him of those qualities which are social. If these are made to take on any proper development they must be drawn out. Influences must be set at work and brought to bear upon him which, without any particular effort of his own, draw them to the surface and give them activity and new spring. Otherwise, in the very nature of the case the social forces in him lie dormant, and gradually become weakened, and sometimes ruinously decay.

It may be said that it is not right for any man to be so related to business as to find no opportunity to cultivate his social nature. I think this is so, but while the practice exists, it requires in woman peculiar characteristics to make her a good wife; and in no direction is the possession more important than in that of active and large social qualities. If she lacks these she cannot, under the present condition of things, make a good

wife, because to be such, she must make *home* a pleasant and desirable place for her husband.

To be a good mother, a woman needs to have not only what may be termed good physical health, but to have also a good physical constitution and a good physical organization. Good motherhood demands of woman that she shall have large nutritive forces. She must be of that build which will give abundant vitality to her offspring during the formative processes and up to birth, and to give it abundant nutriment of the healthiest kind after its birth. She needs, also, to infuse into it after, as well as previous to its birth, healthy magnetism, this passing out of her own body into it by means of those various physical and corporeal contacts, into which a mother and child so frequently and necessarily come.

She needs, also, in order to good motherhood, to have such a mental and spiritual organization as will enable her to fulfill all the duties of a wife without weakening her duties and obligations as a mother. She needs, also, to possess in her bodily organization what may be termed the quality of tenacity to physical life, or in other words, the quality of longevity. Unless *she* possesses this, even though the father may possess it, their child cannot have it to the degree that the father possesses it. Thus, for the want of this quality in herself, though the father may have it, their offspring becomes related to them in the *descending scale*, and such a lack vitiates her qualities of good motherhood in a very eminent degree.

I have said of the native-born women in this country who are competent to make, and who after marriage do make, good wives and mothers, there are only thirty in a hundred. Sincerely, I think this a very liberal percentage, and if my estimate presents the truth, the condition of our women is very deplorable. Because under our civilization as it stands, and under any modifications of it which are likely to be made for a long time, the highest state of life for women ought to be the married state.

A great change for the better might be made in this country. Girl children, who have yet to grow up from childhood, or from young girlhood to womanhood, notwithstanding constitutional defects in their physical organizations, and like defects in their mental and moral organizations, might be so changed by proper training and education, as to fit them to be good wives and good mothers, whereas under the continuance of the present existing forms of education, they are sure to grow up to add to the numbers of those classes out of which good wives and mothers cannot be chosen. If the fathers and mothers of such girls could be so interested in Psycho-Hygiene, as to be willing to place them under influences which are actively and efficiently operative long enough to make constitutional changes, and would reorganize their own households, establishing them on the psycho-hygienic basis, and train their children under proper physiological and psychological regimen, they would see their daughters growing up in very different relations to the family state to what they

now can hope to see. I know this to be true because of the abundant evidences which are before me of its truth.

I know a great many young women who, when they were little children, showed such a combination of traits of character as, had they been developed into full womanhood, would have rendered it impossible for them to make good wives and good mothers; who have been so altered and reconstructed as to grow up to their present adult age and become women well fitted to enter upon, and fulfill successfully, the great combined relations of wife and mother.

It is no assertion at random, it is no hap-hazard statement that I make. It is strictly true that a child inheriting from her parents, and through them from a long line of ancestors, a physical organization which, developed after a certain order, will render her unfit to sustain properly and fitly the wifely and motherly relations, can be taken in childhood and so remodeled, so reorganized and reconstructed as to grow up thoroughly qualified in all the elements of her nature and character to sustain both these relations wisely and well. What is needed is to have the knowledge *how* to do it, the courage to *undertake* to do it, and the *liberty of action to insure* the doing of it. On this point I may have something further to say when I come to talk of the training of girls. At present I pass to the consideration of another class.

Class 2. THOSE WHO CAN AND DO MAKE GOOD WIVES, BUT CANNOT MAKE GOOD MOTHERS. The question is not

an unimportant one whether a woman who is disqualified from becoming a good mother, may rightly become a wife. To this I make answer in the affirmative. Were a woman to know that she could bear no children, it should be no rightful bar to her marriage. True, in such a case, the man whom she was to marry should know the fact, so that if he saw fit on that account to decline to make her his wife, the right and the privilege would be accorded to him. But if he chose to take her, knowing that she would prove impotent, there is nothing in the institution of marriage that would rightfully forbid their becoming husband and wife. For the institution of marriage contemplates the relation of wife as of primary, and, therefore, of higher significance than it does that of mother. A married woman, therefore, should always hold her relations to her husband, provided his relations to her are right, as more important and more sacred than any relations she can hold to her children. She should love her husband better than she loves her children. She should devote herself to his welfare with more assiduity and more self-sacrifice, and with more comprehensive and enduring affection, than she should to her children.

It is a sad state of things which has come to exist in this country, that wives who are mothers frequently substitute affection for their husbands by affection for their children. The evil is a great one, and demands rectification. The woman who has feeble physical frame and large frontal and coronal brain, with small digestive and blood-making organs, and with small back

brain, who is of, or perhaps under, medium height, with flat chest, little or no breasts, small arms, tapering fingers, and small legs, may be competent to perform the duties of a wife with fidelity and satisfaction to her husband and benefit to herself, though she is totally unfit to become a mother. Unfit, because she cannot bear a child without devitalizing herself. Nor can she give to the child constitutional stamina, nor can she give it nutriment enough for its brain to make it hardy. She is, therefore, disqualified for becoming a mother, though if she be left free from the labor and duty of maternity she can be a faithful wife.

There are of this class of American women twenty-five in every hundred. Of those who are married, a large share bear children, though they are organically incompetent and unfit, and, as a consequence, die early, while the majority of their children never get by middle life. To avoid the ruin caused by the premature deaths of those wives and mothers and children, there are but two available remedies at present. One is, for such women to refuse to get married. The other is, for their husbands to refuse to make them bear children.

To the women themselves, as society goes, the remedy of living unmarried is as bad, if not worse, than the disease. Woman in this country is so barricaded by custom, etiquette and fashion, and is so circumscribed in her efforts for self-support, by what are termed right ideas in regard to her appropriate sphere, as to render it almost absolutely necessary for her to marry in order

to live. Only in the relation of wife can she with certainty look forward to any more than a bare subsistence. The delights and comforts of home, the pleasures of well-ordered society and sureties for fair cultivation, and social and well-developed growth, are hers only when she is married. She, therefore, is more likely than not to feel that it is better for her to live a few years and have the blessings of a happy social life, and then die, than it would be to live many more years without much sympathy, with only the most constrained expression of affection from others, and in her advancing years particularly, to find herself quite isolated and alone. So far as she is concerned, the fact that she is not fit to be a mother, though she is well fitted to be a wife is not likely to induce her to abstain from marriage; though the result shall be that by child-bearing she will kill herself, and leave behind her children who cannot live to be of any substantial use on earth.

But this need not be the case if the husbands of such women would meet their cases fairly.

CHAPTER X.

NON-MATERNITY — OR WOMEN WHO CAN AND DO MAKE GOOD WIVES, BUT DO NOT MAKE GOOD MOTHERS.

If so large a proportion of married and marriageable women in the United States — foreign-born women *not* included — as twenty-five in a hundred are so constitutionally organized, and functionally developed, as to render them incompetent to give to offspring healthy bodies and proper combinations of mental and moral faculties, it follows, of necessity it seems to me, that they are not competent to the task of child-bearing and child-rearing without *great injury to themselves.*

If this be so, the question arises and at once assumes a *moral* aspect, whether they are at liberty to become mothers at all. Could they give birth to healthy children, though they did it to their own loss of health and life, the moral aspect of the case might be changed; but to become mothers of children who, in all probability under present customs and habits of training and rearing children in America, can never have good health, though they may live to adult age — while in so doing they make themselves sick and essentially shorten their own lives, does not seem to present in its behalf a right-minded morality. On the other hand, it wears decidedly the appearance of a transaction originating

in heedlessness of consequences, and productive of very ill and very sad results. Justly therefore it may be characterized as immoral, criminal and wicked, for a man and woman to beget and bear children, where the woman is so constitutionally feeble as to forbid the reasonable expectation that during the period of pregnancy, nursing and early rearing, she will be able to give to her offspring, robust constitutions and vigorous functional activities. If to do so be not immoral, it would seem difficult to make any act in one's life such. It is conceded on all sides, that to train a child wrong is wrong. If so, what is the nature and character of the act which begets and conceives a child so that when born it goes wrong by the force of ante-natal impulses — goes wrong because all its predispositions and tendencies are wrong? Writers on moral philosophy agree in saying that whoever makes a fundamental falsehood take the place of a fundamental truth, as though it were a truth, commits a more grievous wrong upon mankind by far, than though he should make a wrong application of a fundamental truth in his conduct in life. For, in the one case he poisons the fountain, and so poisons all who drink, while in the latter he poisons perhaps only himself.

If a feeble, sickly, mal-organized woman only injured herself by acts of conception, the evil would be of comparatively small account, though bad enough at that, but when to the injury *she* receives is added that of giving birth — as all of this class of women does — to children who are either still-born, or if born alive, die

early, or if able to live long into fullness of years, *never* see a single day when existence to them is not a burden, the immorality of such conduct is not doubtful. To any candid mind, at once it becomes clear and conclusive. The law of the case governs the fact of the case, and science determines its character, declaring in precise terms, that women who *cannot* bear healthy and well-disposed children should not have any, and if they do bear children they commit moral wrong.

It is a curious but very significant fact, that the vicious portions of our population have their starting or originating point in families or in parentage, much more moral than themselves. Especially is this true of *native-born* Americans. I have visited jails, penitentiaries, state prisons, houses of correction, poor-houses and lunatic asylums, and made minute and general inquiries, and I could not find five per cent of the whole number of American-born inmates, who could date back two generations to knavish, vicious ancestors. The great majority was made up of persons whose parents were conventionally or morally respectable. How then came they to be adepts in crime or victims to it. I answer, largely by reason in the first place of constitutional proclivities to mental and moral abnormalism, instituted and induced through the ill-health of their mothers, producing mental and moral perversities which their children inherited as predispositions; and in the second place, by reason of the want of such healthful early training and moral instruction as every child must have if in after life he is to keep in the right

way, and which a sickly, peevish, fretful, fault-finding, half-drugged to death mother is quite incompetent to give.

One of the laws of human nature is that physical conditions, or states of body, find their correspondents in mental and moral conditions, or states of mind and heart. Thus if one wants a sound mind he should expect to find it in a sound body more surely than in an unsound one, and a healthy, well-balanced state of the affections in a healthy body rather than in a sickly one. The reason for such expectation is, that body and mind reciprocally influence each other, and that where the ordinary, habitual, or constitutional conditions of body are unhealthy, there must exist in greater or less degree correspondingly unhealthy conditions of mind. These as they exist in the mother may be simply a functional derangement and so be only temporary, or they may be constitutional and so ever-present. Whichever it be, if she is under their influence at conception, and during fœtal life, and during the period of nursing, and during the subsequent period of her child's life in which Nature designs she should be his teacher, guide, inspirer and supporter, he can no more resist their morbid sway than once in the current of Niagara river he could resist going over its "Falls." If then she be in all her structural relations, physical, mental and spiritual, abnormally organized — say feeble in body, morbid in mind and extremely vibratory in spiritual impulses, she is by every law that involves moral considerations enjoined not to have children. Nevertheless

such women keep on having them, and they die, and the mothers weep, and the fathers mourn, and solemn funerals are had, and pious platitudes are uttered, and God's providence is admitted to be mysterious, and resignation to the Divine will is invoked — all this while God's will having been that such children should not be born, their deaths resulting not by a mysterious Providence but strictly in accordance with Law. There are tens of thousands of fathers and mothers in the Republic, who every year are called to mourn over the deaths of little ones whom they dearly love, who ought to repent in sackcloth and ashes for the sin of having given them birth only to have them die. In God's plan of human existence Heaven is not the natural home for infants, but earth is. Children born to the earth, ought of right to themselves and to society and to mankind at large to have life force enough — conditions of living being favorable — to remain here, grow up, mature and die only of old age, when, if they have lived for Humanity and loved God, they will be prepared for Heaven. It is a sin huge enough, for parents to have children who are sufficiently hardy in constitution to live under fair auspices, but who have to die because their parents and the doctors whom they employ do not know enough to keep them alive; but it is in my view a much more enormous sin to give to children so feeble vitality that they cannot live. This is in its inception and in its conclusion so heartless a transaction, as to demand the severest censure. Did it not generally originate in desires quite selfish and in

gratifications mainly lustful, one might pity the ignorance that produces such dire results; but as it is, when children are begotten under promptings of mere animal passion, and born so feeble that they must die, or if they live, suffer death twice told, one does not feel much like pitying, but more like rejoicing that God is true to the great law of the "Fitness of things."

In the pursuit of this censurable course, it is a fair matter for inquiry, which of the two parties—the husband or the wife—is the guiltier? Or, are they both substantially alike guilty? In the view which facts compel me to take, I think the husband is much more to blame, because no woman likes to be sick.

If upon being married and becoming a mother, she is made sick thereby, and kept sick for a long time thereafter, insomuch that it is evident to her and to others, that she cannot endure conditions of maternity without great enfeeblement, she will forego any temporary conjugal enjoyment—if left free to act—rather than be made permanently ill therefrom. She may suffer *once* from want of knowledge or of personal experience, but not the second time. For of all sicknesses, debilities, ailments, illnesses and enfeeblements to which a woman as such, or as a human being, is liable, none so prostrates the higher faculties as child-bed diseases. Once they take on the prolonged form, the subject sinks to the lowest level of responsible personality. Her babe in the cradle is scarcely more characterless than she is. Her body is relaxed in every fibre. If moved, others have to do it. Her mind is weak to a degree

that forbids the exercise of judgment or good sense in matters pertaining to household duties, family cares, nursing, and management of her child, or manifestation of love for her husband. She is entirely dissociated from general society, and takes no interest in matters of public concern. Around her are hired nurses, or her own mother, or her husband's mother; in front of her at special seasons is her doctor; on either side are bottles, and vials, and little plates, and powders and tinctures and stimulants, and anodynes, altogether making her sick room smell like an apothecary's shop. The windows are blinded and placards are on the door, the whole bespeaking anything but health, and its natural concomitant, happiness. Life to such woman in such condition, has no rose-colored hue. Its vapor is murky—not ultra-marine. She cannot bear it, and ever imagine it possible for her to be in an ecstacy. Natural maternity contra-indicates all such surroundings. The hearty woman who can give birth to a healthy child, sits up in a couple of days, dresses and nurses her babe unhelped in a week, and in three weeks is overseeing her household and rejoicing with her husband over the crib of their infant. Women of robust bodies and good constitutions may desire and be willing to have children. It is right that they should and is well that they do, but in all my professional experience I have never known a married woman to whom child-birth was dangerous and child-nursing debilitating, both uniting to destroy her health, who was willing or desirous to have children.

Because, strong as may be the maternal instinct of women in this class, it is true of them, as of every other class, that the desire to have children is bounded and regulated by the hope and expectation of being permitted to nurse their offspring. As an abstract proposition I do not believe that one woman in a hundred who is American born, would choose to become a mother, if it were definitely settled that after the birth of her child her health would forbid her suckling it. Women do not like to become mothers by their own act or choice, to be compelled to become unmaternal thereby. Maternity includes the caring for and nourishing a child quite as much—I think, very much more—as the having it. No woman can feel toward her unborn babe as she should feel toward it, when, nestling in her bosom, she looks down on it and sees it living on her. To expect her to be willing, intelligently and deliberately to join her husband in giving existence to a babe, when she knows beforehand that to give it birth is to render her unfit to do wifely duties not only, but to make it impossible for her to fulfill the natural relations of a mother, is to expect her to consent to be a monster. Such women do become mothers, I know, but it is because they are ignorant. Such women become mothers, I know, who are *not* ignorant, but it is because they are married to men who are thoughtless, and their wives and the children they bear are their victims.

Nature, who abhors all misrule and seeks to avoid its issue, in many instances creates such violent reac-

tions to the outrages imposed by this class of men on their wives, as to render it impossible for their wives to bear *living* children. She debilitates their procreative powers to such a measure that they only act rudimentally. They fail in vigor at a certain point, and miscarriage follows. Many women miscarry at six weeks, many more at twelve weeks, as many more at twenty weeks, and a good many at twenty-eight weeks. If in the early stages all the better, if in the advanced stages still better than to go nearly to full time, and then give birth to a still-born child, or to one so prematurely born as to leave its mother with all the perils of full child-birth on her, while the child itself must die.

Of late public attention has been called by certain physicians, editors and clergymen to the crime of abortion. They claim that the practice of *procuring* loss of embryo is quite common amongst American born women who are married. This practice they characterize as highly immoral, and they appeal to the moral sense of such women as indulge in it, henceforth to cease from it. With them, I recognize the looseness of morals which allows the prospective mother to commit the act of fœticide. With them, also, I feel the need of putting a stop to it. But I confess my astonishment that men eminent in their knowledge of philosophy, of morals and casuistry, should have concluded that all that is needful to cure an evil already so widespread and rapidly on the increase, is to call public attention to it, and make fervid appeals to those committing it to abstain from it.

Is nothing else demanded? Let us see. A pretty, delicate, good-looking woman is married to a hale, hearty, robust man. He finds her to possess eminently those qualities which he desires in a *wife*. She has defects, however. She has little constitutional stamina and very feeble functional force. She, therefore, cannot become a mother without, first, impairing her health; or, second, perhaps without killing her; or, third, if she lives, without giving birth to a very feeble, sickly, pimping baby, and becoming totally unable to fulfill toward her child, the duties and responsibilities of a mother. Now, these relations of hers to child-bearing all could have been readily and with strictest propriety ascertained by the man seeking to make her his wife, before marriage. Notwithstanding these fundamental defects in her physical organization, he courted and married her. If he did not know these peculiarities of hers before, who but himself is to blame? Would a farmer buy a horse for breeding, without satisfying himself that she could answer his ends? Or, if desiring any particular end to be secured, would he take his risks blindly? Why should a man play the foolish in the most important act of his life, and take to himself a woman whom he wants to fulfill the double duty of wife and mother, when she cannot take on herself the latter relation without jeopardy to her life? In the case supposed, however, he has done it, and the question arises whether in the exercise of his love or of his authority, he may impose gestation upon her, thus putting her life in peril, without him-

self incurring blame? For a man living in any neighborhood in our country to be known as habitually exposing his wife to conditions that would place her life in imminent hazard, would be to strip him of all respect, if it did not subject him to punishment. Yet there are such men as I have supposed, thousands and tens of thousands of them—yes, as many as there are women who produce abortions on themselves—who do this very meanness, this great wickedness of exposing their wives to death, by making them take on maternal conditions. The gentlemen who have written on the subject of the criminality of abortion, have not thought it worth while to make any allusion to this horrible crime of enforced pregnancy. In the case supposed, this frail, feeble woman, finding herself prolific, and fearing the result of going to full birth, ponders it long and anxiously. Some friend tells her she can be freed from all her troubles without risk, if miscarriage is procured in the earlier months of gestation, and so it is done. Poor creature! with death staring her in the face if she does *not* produce it, her conscience-keepers tell her she must submit, and take her chances of living through child-labor. They may tell her so, and tell her the truth; but as long as "*self*-preservation is the first law of nature," she will most likely heed her instincts rather than any conscientious scruples they may awaken.

If this evil is ever to be cured, writers other than those who can only see one side of it must engage in its discussion and cure. Men must be made intelligent and moral as well as women. If the latter are to be

taught that abortion cannot be superinduced without the commission of a crime, the former must be made to feel that heedless and selfish cohabitation resulting in propagation of young, is in itself and all its succeedants and consequences a great immorality. If men will love their wives as their own bodies, when these are sickly or feeble in health, or lacking in constitutional stamina, or unwilling to bear children, they will live continently with them; in which case their wives will have no motives to commit abortion. For it follows quite of necessity that if a woman is not made pregnant, she cannot miscarry her young. If they will not do this, but will use their wives, as many men now-a-days do, for purposes of lust, then, however much may be written or said on the subject, miscarriages whether arising in the main from sexual debility, or from the use of mechanical or vitally reactionary causes, will continue to increase in the ratio of the illness or the morbid sensibilities of the parties involved.

It may be thought that for husbands who have wives who are so feeble as to be unable to bear children without great peril to their lives, to forego all conjugal enjoyment except such as is consistent with the entire freedom of their wives from maternity, must in its very nature be quite difficult. Possibly it may be to those of them who prefer their own pleasure to the health and lives of their wives, but to such of them as love and honor their companions it is not at all difficult, nor need it involve great self-denial. If however it were a matter involving large resolution and great self-abnegation, it would

none the less be their duty, for the Christian law for the husband is that he love his wife as himself.

If moralists and casuists would meet these evils, let them induce the husbands of feeble wives, or of wives unwilling to have children, to respect their preferences, and the cure for abortion will be immediate and effectual.

CHAPTER XI.

WOMEN WHO DO NOT MAKE GOOD WIVES, BUT DO MAKE GOOD MOTHERS.

Of this class, in my estimate, I count only twenty per cent, the smallest proportion of the various classes into which I have divided native-born American women. While it is true that the best woman, as such, is she, who, to all other qualifications, can show those which fit her to be a good wife and mother, and while it is true that she, who although she cannot make a good mother, can make a good wife, is a very needful constituent in American society as it stands at present, it is not a whit less true that American society can find good use and good place for those women who though they cannot make good wives do make good mothers. In saying this, I must not be understood as saying or inferring that such women may become mothers outside the marriage pale, but that constituted as they are, there are plenty of men in the Republic who might well become their husbands for the purpose of starting new families or breeds, which should have in them better strains of blood than either of the parents has. Let me make a case, and see how it might work.

Here are two persons, man and woman. The man

is below medium height — say 5 feet 2 inches to 5 feet 4 inches, weighing about 120 to 125 pounds. He is most evidently in the descending scale of his ancestors. They were large, broad-shouldered, big-boned, stout-sinewed men. They had big necks and large back brains dipping down deep into their napes. Their ear holes were three-fourths of an inch below the outer angle of the eyelids. They had foreheads which were protuberant just above the eyes, but which higher up sloped back, making them remarkable for their powers of observation and for their knowledge of matters of life in detail, while for their abstract powers — or their capacities for reflective thought — they were not remarkable. Their temperaments were bilious, or nervous-bilious, and if they sickened and died they were naturally much more likely to do so from inflammatory diseases, than from those which originate in nervous exhaustion.

Their descendant is quite unlike them. He has a small neck, is of small bone, has a great hollow in the nape of the neck, is of sanguine or nervous-sanguine temperament, has a receding forehead just above the eye and a jutting forehead higher up, has the orifice of his ears and the outer angle of his eyes about on a level, and around the largest part of his head, measured from front to rear, is as large within two to two and a half inches as he is around his body at the pit of his stomach.

Now take the woman. She is of bilious temperament, of dark skin, dark hair, and dark eyes, above

medium height, round in limb but not fat, strong in muscle and compact and stout in bone. She is broad-chested, with large breasts, able to give abundant food to her children when she comes to bearing. She is capacious in the abdomen, has large stomach making her a good eater, has large liver, very large organic nerves, giving her blood-making organs great capacity and great activity. Her head is set on a large, short, stout neck, and while she has or is likely to have mental powers of a vigorous and very creditable cast, she is sure to have them run in a very maternal groove. The love of life is very strong in her, and so her likings for the means whereby to make it comfortable and prosperous are also abundant. She is of the earth, earthy. Not mean, not basely selfish, not niggardly, not miserly. Neither is she ungenerous nor unsusceptible to humane motives. But self-love, which is always the basis of self-respect, is a predominant quality in her moral constitution, and whoever takes her for a wife should know this, and be aware that Nature has organized her for the special purpose of bearing and rearing children. Bring these two persons together as husband and wife, understandingly, and the man whose race, breed or family is in his own person pretty much extinct, and who, were he to marry a woman whose superior qualities are in her wifely and not in her motherly nature, could not hope to reconstruct and reorganize his family, will, by the marriage supposed, do it and save his name from perishing. She will make a first-class breeder of children, who will take on all that

is good and desirable in both parents, leaving unorganized and so dead what in either or both is undesirable. Thus the man, though small, will have large children, who will have plenty of nutritive-nervous force in combination with good intellectual and moral faculties, and who will be able to endure persistent and close application to study as well as to work.

When a boy, I knew a case exactly in point. There lived not more than a mile from my father's house a man who was below medium size — a little fellow, what among the Dutch farmers is called a *titman*. His wife was a woman of the class which does not make good wives but makes good mothers. She bore him in a course of years six sons, not one of whom weighed nine pounds at birth, but every one of whom weighed over two hundred pounds before he was twenty-five. I recollect often to have heard my parents talk over the matter with our neighbors, and interpret it as some freak of nature; but since coming myself to a study of the laws of development of human beings, I have seen that it was no show of chance, but was in that case only a marked instance of nature's constant efforts to make good the losses which the ignorance or the inconsiderateness of mankind is introducing. In looking about me to gather up statistics, I have been greatly interested to find so many married persons living together and having children after this order.

In the case I have supposed, if the man marries the woman, he cannot expect her to be a wife of the first quality as well as a mother of the first class, because she

has not the mental and moral organization to make her such; and if his first and primary thought in marrying is to get a wife, and his after thought is to have children, he should not marry her; for she will disappoint him. But if his first thought—as in his case it should be—is to save his name and race from extinction, and his second thought is the wifely relations, then he may marry and live happily with her; for all such women as have in them largely predominant the motherly instincts, make good housekeepers and lovable companions, thrifty, watchful, sagacious, economical, and moral if well educated, unless their maternal love is interfered with. Then they become unloving and sometimes uncomfortable to live with. No such woman ever can love her husband as well as she loves her children; for she generally loves him in the main because he is the father of her children. For these she lives and must live. Their welfare is the theme of her thought and her talk day after day. And her husband is of value as he aids her in promoting their happiness.

I have seen a goodly number of men married to such women and living unhappily with them. They were men who in order to make them happy in the married state needed women each of whom should think her husband unsurpassed, who should love him therefore better than any or than all other human beings. There are women, plenty of them, who can and do thus love their husbands, but they belong to the class who make good wives but not good mothers. They do not belong to the class now under consideration. These men

made mistakes in choosing such women as they did. They acted ignorantly I know, but in all the departments of social life there is none other where such sad results flow from ignorance as from ill-assorted marriages. In making their choice these men were governed by their fancies, or by their impressions of the characteristics which the women of their choice respectively possessed. Perhaps they were drawn to a decision by the physical qualities of their wives quite as much as by any imagined intellectual and moral fitness they had. A fine-looking, sprightly-acting, good mannered girl of fair intelligence and with plenty of animal spirits, when brought into familiar social intercourse with a man who is looking for a wife, is quite likely, unconsciously to herself, to make deep magnetic impressions on him. He gets his head distracted and thinks himself deeply in love with her, when in fact he is not in love with her at all. He is only *mesmerized*, while her nature is unstirred. If, however, he imagines himself to be so far attached to her as to make it a matter of great importance to him that she become his wife, he will not be likely to find her rejecting him at last, provided she makes up her mind that he will make a kind husband, giving her a home of comfort and plenty, and is likely to make a loving father to her children. The depths of her nature he cannot sound—no *man* can. He may play the gallant, may court her with the finest and tenderest address, may lay his fortune at her feet, may plead eloquently, may pour out his soul in love; she will not, because she cannot, love

him first, last and only; and never will she come so closely to genuine expression of love for him—her husband, as when she can lay a baby in his lap and truly call him its father.

Much and not infrequently severe criticism is passed upon this class of women, because they do not love their husbands better. They are not to blame. They cannot control their affections any more than other classes of persons can, and all persons of large and varied experience know that they cannot love, or cease to love at a word. Love is a compound sentiment, made up of large esteem and strong desire, but the constituent elements are in different proportions in different persons. In this class of women the desire is the larger moiety. It is with them as it was with the Jewish women, who had a passion for child-bearing and to whom sterility was the greatest affliction and mortification they could suffer. A girl of this class can not endure the thought of living a maiden all her life. She will run any risk rather than remain unmarried. So prominent is this feeling in her that it influences her social intercourse in a marked manner oftentimes. She thinks of it from puberty onward wherever she goes. Were it the custom of the country as it was in many of the more secluded towns in "the North country" of England fifty years ago, for girls who did not get husbands to have children outside the marriage pale and lose no caste thereby, failing marriage, she would have children independent of its sanction. As it is, however, she sets all her arts at work to get a husband and a

home, that these may serve the purpose of gratifying her desire to have children. The women of this class are seldom seen living single lives. Where you find one of them thus living, you will find ten of the class who are not fit to make either good wives or good mothers. Nor do they furnish in any sensible measure recruits to our houses of ill-fame. They are not organized to live as *demireps*, and are seen only sparely on our city pavements or as frequenters of houses of assignation.

Constituted as American society is, they form an elemental force for its improvement of the highest importance, because there is amongst American men as large a proportion to the whole number, as they make of the whole number of women, who need to marry them to redeem their family state from destruction. If one want is needed more than another to be supplied with us, it is that of vigorous, robust, hardy, enduring girls, who can work as our grandmothers when girls worked, who can live as they lived, in the main free from sickness, and bear as they bore, large families of children —say from six to twelve in number, and die as they did from old age. Now, our American-born girls when grown and married cannot bear between the ages of eighteen and forty-five more than three or four children on an average, while our foreign-born women on an average bear from seven to eight children. The class of women of whom I am now speaking, however, can keep pace with the strongest and hardiest German, Irish and Swedish women. They can stand as much

pressure from gestation, can give as much suck, are better nursers and care-takers of their young while they are helpless, and generally are much better educators. Inheriting as they do their predispositions to thought and to conduct in life from American progenitors, they are progressive, intuitive and liberal-minded. They reach forward to the future rather than cling to the past, and are sure to imbue their children with ideas and notions, with principles and preferences for things that are new. In the hundreds of them with whom I have been made personally acquainted, I have never yet found a conservative. This is all natural enough. Living as they do for their children, they have to look ahead. Their instincts not only but their observation tells them this. Their self-abnegation makes them sagacious. Forgetful of what belongs to their own welfare exclusively, and wakeful and apprehensive for what may serve their children's interests, they see through what changes American society passes in a generation, and must continue to pass for many, many generations to come. Clearly they see that what answers to their own satisfaction will not satisfy their children, for more likely than not it will have to give way to something new, and therefore their children cannot rest on it durably. They have to impress them then with the feeling that this age is one of growth, and that other things being equal, who grows the fastest and at the same time most symmetrically takes front rank.

Where such persons marry as in the given case I have supposed, I have noticed that the transmission of

qualities of the parents usually takes place in the following order: To a boy the mother gives her locomotive and nutritive organization and her passional and moral qualities, while the father gives the respiratory and bony structure, with the intellectual qualities. To a girl she gives the respiratory and bony structure with her intellectual organization, while the father gives the locomotive and nutritive structure with the passional and moral faculties. If I am right, and I think I am, for I have observed thousands of such cases — then the fact is that by such marriages male children are more directly and immediately improved in their constitutional conditions than female children are, inasmuch as they get more of physical stamina from their mothers than girls do — the law of the case being that fathers should convey their qualities good and bad in larger measure to girls, and mothers to boys, unless by intermingling the two strains of blood, check of transmission of qualities is introduced, or some new organization of forces heretofore unknown on either side is established.

If then, as a general thing, the constitutional and functional vigor of boys is more directly increased by such marriages than that of girls is, Nature sends the processes of revitalization of the girls one generation farther on. To enable them to have girl-children as strong, enduring and intellectual as their own brothers were, these girls when grown should marry, not such men as their fathers were, but as their brothers are — men who are an improvement on their fathers; thus whatever be the relations to size, endurance and lon-

gevity of the boys they may bear — if they should have any — their girls will be sure to grow up large, capacious and competent to become mothers in the better sense of the word.

CHAPTER XII.

WOMEN WHO, AS SOCIETY GOES, CAN NEITHER MAKE GOOD WIVES NOR MOTHERS.

I NOW come to the consideration of a class of women who, in all their elements of character, are to me more interesting than any class which America produces. They are so:

First, because of the peculiarities of their organizations.

Second, because of the intrinsic human strength which they possess.

Third, because of their great necessities for peculiar development by reason of their peculiar organizations.

In my division of American-born women into classes, my readers who have followed me hitherto in the discussion of the subject, will recollect that I estimate this class in our republic as high as twenty-five in each hundred. I feel sure that I have not over-rated them. They are to be found in every neighborhood and city in our land. They are wives, though as society goes they ought not to be, having married for homes. Many of those who are married are mothers, because they became wives; though as society goes they should not be mothers. They are teachers in schools, seamstresses in tailors' and mantua-makers' shops, sewers on bonnets

and gew-gaw finery. They are shoe-binders to wholesale merchants; girls working in kitchens and in factories; and here and there one may be found as a clerk in a store, a compositor in a printing office, a sender of telegrams in a telegraph-room, a physician, a merchant, a minister of the Gospel, a public lecturer, or a student at school. But wherever they are seen — outside of a few callings, for the filling of which they always get compensation inferior to men, though they do their work quite as well and in many instances better than men — for every step of progress they make they have to struggle and contend with society, with the church, and with civil government, as though the point at issue was one of life or death to both parties.

It is greatly to the credit of American institutions that such and so large a class of women exists therein. They are not to be found in any such proportion of the whole women population in any other nation on the globe. Only amongst peoples nominally Christian are they to be found at all; and outside of America in any nation only rarely. With us, if I am not mistaken in my conclusions, they will soon constitute the more numerous and dominant class; and if I am right, that they will do so will be owing to our political institutions. Essentially they are the product of Freedom; and though they have not yet been permitted to enjoy in absolute fullness the blessings which liberty protected by law legitimately confers on all to whom she does justice, they have felt these in a measure, and so have come up to be worthy of the notice and admiration and

high regard of all persons who are glad to see human nature manifested in new and original forms. Thinking men are not astonished to see new developments of human nature within the masculine sphere; for this, especially under free or partially free institutions has come to be quite common. It creates no surprise to learn that this man or that indicates genius in directions heretofore unknown. We admire such manifestation and development of the human soul, and regard with graciousness the individual who thus opens our eyes to new and fresh possibilities of human growth. But we have been accustomed to look upon woman as developing human nature in her own person after long established and ordinary forms only. When therefore attention is challenged to the exhibition of character new and peculiar, showing such combination of reason and spiritual impulse and moral consciousness as to make the woman having them put on individuality or personality, approximating closely in strength, in positiveness and efficiency to that which belongs to, and which we usually see in the higher and better class of men, we are so surprised as to be shocked by it, and to feel that the exhibition is eccentric, abnormal or quite undesirable. In America we have to get over this; for there is no help for it. Such womanhood is the outgrowth of the principles of liberty applied to individual life; and if there be in the class now under consideration any abnormal or unsymmetrical show of character, it is not to be accounted for nor charged to essential defect in the nature of the institutions under which it has come to

life, nor to the depravity of human nature, but to the imperfect application of the principles underlying our institutions to human nature. What this class of women wants to the perfection of their characters is full enjoyment of the rights of personality, and the privileges and immunities which justice confers thereupon. In time any little eccentricities which they now show will give way to the advancing spirit of justice and liberty as this touches them in their personal and social relations to life.

I have said this class of women belongs to no other class in America so as to be absorbed into it and represented by it. It is a class standing by itself; for since Adam's day there has never been seen on the Earth till now, any such class in any such numbers among any people. True, at every epoch and in every era of human civilization women have appeared who have been set apart from the mass of women of their day by marked diversities; but generally their characteristics have been undesirable for women to possess—have been deviations from, instead of approximations to, model human nature. In their cases it could not have well been otherwise, inasmuch as the social, civil, military and religious polity under which they were born, reared and educated, was in itself very defective. At no time however in the past has any people shown amongst its women sufficient numbers of persons who were possessed of characteristics so diverse from those which belong generally to the mass, as to be regarded and denominated peculiar, and thus thought worthy to have a pecu-

liar nomenclature; but with us such a class has so far made for itself already an original position, as to have accredited to it a classification, and thus be known through the Republic as the "strong-minded" class.

I have said that this class of American-born women is very interesting to me for several reasons. Let me repeat these in order, and somewhat elucidate them:

First, because of the peculiarities of their organizations.

No close observer can come into the presence of one of these women without being led to remark how differently she is made up on the whole from what women ordinarily are. Her very physical formation is peculiar when considered in comparison with that of the average style of build of American women. She has what they have not, a very large frontal brain, showing that she possesses large intellectual faculties. Her power of observation is great. She shows this in the exercise of all her special senses. She is quick to see, acute to hear, sensitive to touch, of acute sense of smell, and particularly susceptible to the impressions of taste. Her discerning powers therefore are always active when she is conscious, and, without any special education to that end, she comes to a knowledge of things in detail, which separates her from the generality of women around her and classifies her distinctly. If she is permitted to grow up without proper education and training, this super-activity of her perceptive powers is likely to develop in her marked faults, and give to her an unpleasant notoriousness in society as a busybody, always

peering and prying into other people's affairs. If, however, proper development of these powers takes place, then, in whatever social relation she is found, she will show great intuition, great power of management, great capability of comprehending and understanding business affairs, and whether married or unmarried, a competency to take part in the direction of interests involving human welfare, that oftentimes quite surprises men who think that woman is made only to hold social or public relations to life quite subordinate and inferior to man. It is not only however in her powers of observation that she is remarkable. Her reflective organs indicate faculties of a high order for abstract or philosophic thought. She is more likely than not to be a good reasoner, being able to lay down premises and draw conclusions correctly, dealing with principles in their own nature, as distinct from the effects which their application or employment produces; understanding well, therefore, the causes of things, and quite as competent—other things being equal—as man is, to establish a legitimate chain of connection between causes and effects, and to deduce right conclusions and establish right judgment thereon. Some of the very best reasoners which America has produced, or is producing, are to be found among this class. Not that they reason as comprehensively about public affairs as men do who are in public life, but the difference between them and such men is not a whit greater than that which exists between men themselves, who are in public and who are in private life. The power to reason about any great principle or

interest, affecting the welfare of an individual or of a people, is largely dependent upon knowledge of the conditions of such person or people, which knowledge comes by study and by experience, oftentimes under obligations imposed, or responsibilities or duties to be performed. It is said that practice makes perfect, and it is so in the province of abstract reasoning as truly as in that of practical reasoning. No person can therefore be equal in the power of applying principles or in the elucidation of facts, who has little or no opportunity to study the nature of these principles as applied to the facts, with him who has such opportunities. Give to the women for whom I claim the possession of equal natural powers with men, the same education as to our great men, and they will become as great. I say so by parity of reasoning, for wherever they are permitted to take the same positions as men, they show as great competency as men. While this is true, however, of the class of women under consideration, it is not true of the majority of other classes of women. These do not show so large reason because they have small reasoning faculties, and they represent the average level of American men. But this class of women for whom I claim equality in reasoning powers with our great men, shows the possibilities of human nature, and this, too, not in abnormal but in approximately natural forms.

Pardon this digression, however, and let me pass to a still further examination of their peculiar qualities. They bear, physiologically considered, marks of a pecu-

liar organization. Generally speaking, the more highly and fully developed of them will show great tendency to longevity, great power to resist disease, great power of physical endurance with only a moderate quantity of food. These, as compared with the physiologically organic elements of character shown by masses of American-born women, are decided peculiarities. Look and see if it is not so. Our women generally are not long-lived, nor are they capable of living healthfully under unfavorable circumstances, nor can they labor hard, nor can they live upon little food. The exhibitions are all the other way. They eat frequently and inordinately. They are sick or ailing half the time. They cannot work hard. They die early.

Second, because of the intrinsic human strength which they possess.

Men are disposed to consider the nature of woman to be radically or generically different from that of man, whereas it is only specifically different. The things which men and women hold in common are far more numerous and more important to their respective as well as to their collective welfare, than the things which they hold in difference. Thus, notwithstanding the difference in sex, the human nature in them both is more influential, and, therefore, more worthy of consideration than their sexual natures can possibly be. It is a great mistake, therefore, as well as a great wrong which society, the church and civil government have committed against woman, to institute for her and establish and impose upon her positions, relations, responsibili-

ties and obligations in life, having their origin mainly and therefore their significance chiefly in considerations pertaining to her gender. God always legislates on general principles, or if He does specifically legislate, it is done with reference to the supremacy and establishment of general principles; certainly it is so as far as his legislation in Nature is concerned. He manifests himself in highest attitudes of affection and regard for man, at the point wherein all human beings have things in common, and not where they have as numerous diversities as they have distinct personalities. If, therefore, we take the Divine idea of the relations to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness which woman rightfully holds, and work these up into such human association and enforcement as the necessities of her nature demand, we must come to a recognition of the fact, that wherever she holds powers, faculties, qualities, passions, propensities, instincts, impulses like to those which man holds, she is to have protection in their use, enjoyment, development, education, and in the results which flow therefrom, as fully as he has. To make her essentially human and incidentally female, and yet to treat her essentially as female and incidentally as human, is to pervert the work of God, to debase her nature, to degrade the nature of man himself, and to establish therefore essentially false relations between God, man and her. Out of such falsity what can be expected in the justice of the case or in the nature of things but ill-results, and such as are witnessable in every society, community, nation and people under the whole heaven. Only

in America are they less than in any other nation, because so far as our political institutions are concerned, these are organically based on liberty, and so on justice to women; and as far as they have had opportunity to be made practical, they have touched her to her benefit, and so have developed in her, within the class now under consideration, those elements of character which are natural and fit for woman to hold. If, under any philosophic view of the case, woman, therefore, can approach the natural, the right, the proper and the true position, then the sexual in her takes a subordinate, and the human in her takes a superior place. Nothing has encouraged me so much in looking into and contemplating the possibilities of the future of our great republic, as to see a class of women rising up in whom the sexual is made to take a subordinate place, and to keep it, as *specific* qualities of character always should be kept. I like very much to see strong-minded women—women who can think, reason, feel and act as men do, not because men act as human beings of the male gender, but because being in the enjoyment of a large liberty in this country to act naturally, they do not act in view of their sex, but in view of the grand and sublime elements that belong to them as human beings. To see women, therefore, approximating to men because men are human, is to give great joy to my heart—a joy as great when she thus acts, as my grief is great when I see her sacrificing all the dignities of her humanity, to the clamorous demands of her sexual nature, walking, talking, dressing, eating, drink-

ing, thinking, acting, feeling on all occasions, under all circumstances and in all places as though the other elements in her nature to be respected by herself, or by men, or to be honored by God, must be subordinate to her gender.

It is for the reason that in this class of women in our country the human controls so thoroughly the sexual, that, as society is constituted and government operates, they are unfitted to become wives and mothers. A wife in American society is expected to hold relations to her husband mainly from the point of her sex. A mother is expected to hold relations to her husband and her children from the point of her sex; and these in every direction. The women who possess so much intrinsic human strength as the women of the class now under consideration do, should not, as society at present regards women, become wives or mothers, because they cannot without doing positive outrage to themselves, bury up all their instincts, their intelligence and their moral sensibilities in the fulfillment of two specific relations, which, however important in themselves, are not, nor were they ever intended by God to be, relations of the foremost character. I therefore am glad that these women are determined, notwithstanding the pressure of society, the criticisms of the church, and the injustice of government, to claim for themselves and maintain for themselves the rights of person and of property; the privileges of citizenship, and a full enjoyment of all the advantages to growth and culture which birth and education in a free country proffer.

Third, because of their great necessity for peculiar development, by reason of their peculiar organizations.

Gradually, intelligent persons are coming to see, and pretty thoroughly to understand, that the leading traits or characteristics which human beings show, are in large measure owing to their peculiar physical or bodily developments. By and by, it will be much better understood and comprehended than now, that no system of psychology or moral or spiritual science can be established and depended upon, which does not have its basis in physiological science or in qualities of physical organization. There is not only the intellectual and moral difference which one readily sees between the well-educated Anglo-Saxon and the New Zealander, but there is also as wide and palpable difference in their physical structures. I hold that this latter difference necessarily would render, other things being equal, a like development of character between two such persons impossible. The difference in the shape of the head, in the organization of the heart, in the size of the lungs, in the size and vigor of the organic nerves, in the make-up of the bones and muscles, is such that no intellectual training, nor moral opportunities, nor religious culture, nor social advantages—though these were the same—would make a New Zealander and an Englishman substantially alike in individual characteristics. Under very favorable conditions, both might become well-trained, well-educated, and finely-cultured men; but the Englishman would have greatly the advantage at the start, and hence, would much more

readily apprehend and comprehend truths of high order, than the New Zealander could. The only way, then, to make a New Zealander equal to an Englishman or Frenchman, German or American, must, in my view, necessarily consist in changing the form of his physical organization. What is true in the case supposed, is proportionally true as between all persons who have widely varying physical structures. It so happens that the class of women whose qualities are just now under consideration, are remarkable for their peculiar physical forms. As a necessary consequence, they are as remarkable for their peculiar intellectual and moral organizations.

No one can reason correctly about them from any basis, which would be correct with reference to American women in general. From the mass of our women this class is separated by as wide distinctions and as marked diversities of physical organization, as the highest grade of Englishmen is from a New Zealander. No one in discussing the abstract rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, would determine the question in any practical way, in view of the necessities of a New Zealander. No one would think of making civil government or civilized society assume formal and fixed conditions, in view of what New Zealanders might need. The Chinese are coming into the United States, it is said, in large numbers. It is not proposed by any one, so far as I know, that society with us, whether it involves personal or political rights and advantages, shall so modify itself, or be modified, as to conform to

the present aims, purposes, and aspirations of this new class of population. On the other hand, it is asserted, and, I think with great pertinence, that the Chinese shall be given to understand that if they are to live with us and become constituent elements of American society, wherever they may dwell, they must become Americans. We cannot become Chinese. They represent the lower, the less favorable forms of human life, of human civilization, and of human culture. They are below us in the knowledge of the arts and sciences. They are not up to our level in their moral comprehension and spiritual enlightenment. We cannot go down to them. Our duty lies in taking away from their path all existing obstructions, so that they may more readily, if possible, come up to our acknowledged and average position. Just so is it with reference to this class of women. They are the more advanced portion of womanhood in our country. They have larger, broader, nobler, and more extended views than the mass of American women have. They represent larger capabilities, more thorough practical capacities, and much greater intellectual competence; and in taking account of what society or civil government ought, in view of their advanced positions, to do, it becomes needful that arrangements should be made to suit them; that instead of insisting that they shall do violence to their organic forces, and so debase and degrade themselves by assuming conditions of ignorance, inefficiency, incompetency, and spiritual inertia; or that they shall keep within those conditions of life which at present

are supposed to constitute woman's apropriate sphere, we should insist upon legislation being so modified, custom and etiquette in society and public opinion so changed, that they may find the largest possible liberty for growth, and the largest freedom possible for making their growth practically useful, not only to themselves individually, but to the commonwealth of which they are constituents.

The men of our generation, and the women in large measure, as yet have failed to see how great a proportion of the whole number of women in the Republic this class composes. They have also failed to see almost entirely as yet, how lavishly endowed with intellect, vigor and moral virtue the women of this class are. I do not speak at random, nor do I say this to make a point. I say it because I am sure it is an actual fact, and one which all persons, having fair measure of regard for the advancement of humanity, for the promotion of the public good, and the progress of liberty, must be glad to have substantiated. For many years I have observed and sought to make myself familiar with the leading qualities and characteristic powers of American women, determining to settle, for myself at least, the question as to what may be called their sphere, and their rights therein, from the point of their natural and acquired capacities. My investigations led me to make the divisions which I have made, but I had no idea that I was to find so large a portion of the whole number of women marked by the great diversities which this class so extensively and illustriously exhibits.

When I awoke, in part, to comprehend that a fourth part of our native-born women is organized after an order and built up after a method which involves physical, intellectual and moral forces, quite as great as those which an equal number of the better class of our men shows, I confess to having been greatly astonished.

Immediately I set to work to see whether these women are as widely distinguished in their individual characteristics from each other as they are from the other classes of American women, and this I found to be true. I yielded, therefore, to the impression that the exhibition is an original manifestation of nature, and that they are not a species of mankind consanguineously related, and constituting a peculiar family; but that they are a new development, showing not a deviation from the normal line of development; but on the other hand, rather an approximation to it, being an improvement on all styles and forms of womanly organization which the world has ever before seen.

Wherever, therefore, I have heard of or seen a woman who, in her personal or social life, has shown qualities of character so unlike those which women ordinarily show, as to render her conspicuous, or as to give her marked position, I have sought to make her personal acquaintance, or else to gather up such a mass of facts with reference to her, as to be able to generalize safely with regard to her characteristics, and to classify her. It has been very interesting to me to find that wherever I have come to know such a woman, or such a girl, whether in her teens, or as yet not having arrived at

puberty, such woman or girl shows an idiosyncrasy or order of qualities which makes her strongly individual, and gives to her an air and bearing which stamp her as belonging to herself, no other woman or child being like her. Thus, as I investigated and reflected, as I gathered facts and generalized, as I referred to first principles and classified, I found that every such woman seemed to have an intellectual and moral organization that marked and qualified her, as distinctly as did her own features, from any other woman. This, to me, was something very novel and quite startling, until I became accustomed to see it, and was familiar with it. For, taking American women as they run, they are as much alike in their general aims and purposes and plans in life, as all the peas are in a half bushel of them. They are so gregarious, that what one does, if she does it first, the next ninety-nine will do. They live in herds; they are molded, guided, shaped and trained by Fashion. What a half dozen women in any community do, the next half dozen will do, whether this be the wearing of a style of dress, or the setting of a table; the furnishing of a house; the going to a concert; the giving of a party; the schooling of children, or the going to church. Fashion forces them, because their qualities of individual character and their elements of personality are alike, and in manner of expression so much below the social elements which make them up, that they have but little power of resistance to the latter. Thus they are modified in mass, and molded after a common pattern.

The women, however, of the class of which I am now talking, do nothing after this sort. What each one thinks is best for her to do she does, whatever society or public opinion may say. To ridicule her for this strength, to sneer at her, to bring public opinion to bear with obtrusive force upon her, in the hope of weakening her courage, destroying her faith and circumscribing her liberty, is one of the meanest things that any human being, or set of human beings, can do. It is so:

1. Because the peculiarities which such women show are greatly to the credit of human nature, and greater to the credit of liberty.

2. Because, being essential characteristics in their natures, these women cannot help themselves.

3. Because the womanhood of our country needs this kind of womanly manifestation to save it from rapid rottenness and ruin.

CHAPTER XIII.

COMPETENCY OF THIS CLASS OF WOMEN.

Underlying the general prejudice which exists largely with men of the American republic, in respect to what may be fairly considered right and proper for woman to do, there is an instinct, or intuition, which is constantly at work, forcing them in a measure at least, to do her justice. The evidence of the existence of this intellectual or moral conviction, is seen in the opening up of opportunities and facilities for her thorough education. This will, if one is old enough, revive by contrast his recollections of the comparative advantages for intellectual training and comprehensive education for boys and girls, for young men and young women in our country twenty-five or thirty years since; and he can readily comprehend how much that difference has been diminished. Then, to girls was given a fair English education. They were only taught rudimentally the higher branches of learning. They were supposed to be naturally incompetent to understand mathematics. They were never instructed in the elements of logic. To be able to read fairly, to write so that possibly one could decipher their chirography, to understand arithmetic as far as the rule of three, to spell somewhat correctly,

to know a little in many other directions, but not so much as to be of practical service, was the extent to which their scholastic education was carried. The more favored, perhaps, advanced somewhat beyond this point. Generally, however, a thoroughly educated girl, or a well-informed, highly cultured and accomplished woman, was rare. Boys and girls went to school together until puberty. From that time, where advantages could be given to the former, they were in almost every instance concentrated upon them, greatly to the disadvantage and injury of the girls in the family. In no part of our country was there a single school to be found, where instruction was given to girls so thoroughly that they became sufficiently learned to justify the bestowment of diplomas. Collegiate courses of instruction did not exist for them in any institution.

How is it now? There are very fine schools, incorporated under charters of the State, in many States in the Union, where young girls can go and remain until they are well educated in all branches of learning; where also they can thoroughly study the classics and the languages of other peoples; where they can go through thorough discipline in mathematics; where science opens her libraries and permits them to become familiar with her secrets, so that if they desire, they can make themselves as close students and as accomplished graduates as the young men of our country can, and in many instances do. Besides these schools which are kept exclusively for young women, there are very fine educational advantages offered them in many

academies, and in some collegiate institutions, at which young men are students, and from which they, like the young men, can become graduates. Upon observation, it will be found that the young women of our land who have accepted these very fine advantages for education in common with young men, uniformly, and, I may say, almost universally, belong to the class of our population whose characteristics, rights, aims and purposes I am now considering, and who in the language of the day are called "strong-minded." As all causes, when active, produce results, and conduct, when determinate, involves consequences good or bad, the question is a fair one to ask, and society, the church and civil government, are bound to give answer—What is to be done with this class of women when they become thoroughly educated?

It is to be borne in mind that some of them are physically as well as mentally unfit for motherhood. To induce these to enter the marriage relation with the view of becoming mothers as well as wives, is to induce them to kill themselves, or to be killed. Child-bearing they cannot stand. The wifely relations they might bear, could they be found by men who would understand and appreciate their intellectual tendencies and their spiritual proclivities. But no matter how well these women might be loved and honored, cherished and cared for by their husbands, some of them surely could not live were they to bear children. Their physical structures contra-indicate motherhood.

It is unsafe always to subject a woman to the process

of child-bearing, whose head around its largest part measures as much within an inch or an inch and a-half as her body around the waist, or around the region of the stomach. Where women have large heads and small stomachs, the organic relation indicates the necessity of freedom from child-bearing. Such a person has not constitutional vigor—what we call *stamina;* what may be termed *staying power;* what sometimes is called organic vitality—to endure the kind of taxation common to women consequent on maternity. To subject such person to the tax of bringing forth young under conditions unfavorable to health, is to derange all her functional activity and her constitutional force, to break down her physical health and destroy her life. Until a better knowledge exists with men and women how to live together as husbands and wives, without having children; the women who are organized as I have described, have no right to marry, for the very good and sufficient reason that no human being has the right to commit suicide, however slow the process may be. Child-bearing with such women, is wife-murder of such women. There is no getting away from this statement. Facts are hard things to fight. Every day the close observer notices, or may notice, the deaths of such women. They are to be found in every neighborhood. They die early; die immediately, or soon after, or at no distant period after child-bearing. This kills them. If they may not marry, because they may not consent to kill themselves nor to be killed; what shall they do for a living? They are physical creatures, and

have physical wants. These wants have been increased in number, and their sensibilities intensified by reason of development and culture of their higher powers and faculties. Every educated woman—other things being equal—is likely to have, and is entitled to have, more wants than a barbarian, or a savage woman. One's needs are in proportion to his capacities and practical uses of them. The more comprehensive one becomes in his power of thought, the more extended becomes his power of practical application of such thought. Logically, then, he needs more tools to work with; and his wants oftentimes serve, or should serve, the purposes of aids to him in accomplishing desired ends. To educate women of naturally large and comprehensive minds, so that they shall be well disciplined and highly cultured, and then to say that they shall have no work in the world to do,—is to place them where, of all classes of persons, they necessarily must become the most miserable. What can be worse for a human being, whether man or woman, than to be consciously fitted for great endeavors, and then to be deprived of all opportunities for putting them forth? No failure of which a man well can form conception, can be worse in contemplation than this. All consciousness, in order to induce satisfaction and happiness, must have room and place for exercise. A woman thus educated must have a sphere comportable with her capacities. She cannot occupy a sphere suited to a woman of few ideas and with no ambition. She has not been educated to fill it; but she has been trained to an entirely different

sphere; and unless by general consent and public approval, she is to be permitted to occupy it, and take equal chances for success with others, whether men or women, in any field of labor she may choose, she should not have been educated. To my mind it follows logically, that thorough education of women must enlarge their spheres of private action. They cannot be kept to the routine of the old regimen. They would not stay there if they were placed there. It would be impossible for them to do it. They must have opportunities equal to their abilities; otherwise the whole action of our people in giving them large education is intrinsically wrong and practically ruinous.

I put the question fairly for an answer, and ask every one to whom it may come, to answer it to him, or to herself, what is to be done with our educated women in this country? It is no answer to say that they should get married.

1. Because they cannot get married until men ask them to do it? If they could get married, some of them would not live happily. This can be determined *a priori*, or before marriage, just as well as afterward.

2. If they were to get married, some of them would not live; marriage would kill them.

3. Others of them, not unlikely, would prove so ill-fitted to its relations and duties, that they would ruin their own children, and spoil the happiness and comfort of their husbands.

What, then, shall be done with them? It is no indication of large foresight to unfetter their minds, and

bind their hands and feet. It is not philosophical to educate them, and throw them into prison. It is not the exhibition of Christian sentiment to train them to take care of themselves, and then insist that they shall not do it, but shall be cared for by their fathers, brothers, husbands, society, or government. If they are educated to knowledge, why should they not be permitted to make practical use of it? If they do well, it is well; if ill, they are the losers. Give them freedom, and then hold them responsible for the use or abuse of it, in the same way and manner as other citizens are held. Let them be regarded, treated, dealt with precisely the same as men are. They ask this; it is right and just that they should have it.

The rights of men should be accorded to them; the privileges and immunities and opportunities which men have by custom and the authority of law, should also be theirs. They should enter into the fields of effort always waiting for laborers to their harvests, to succeed or fail, as their fitness should determine. If because of their being women they are incompetent to succeed, it is just as well for their fathers, their brothers, their husbands, society, or the government, to take care of them, feed, clothe, and house them after they have proved that they cannot take care of themselves, as it is before they have made the effort to do so. In my judgment, it is much better. For now, in every community, can be found women who have to be taken care of, eking out a precarious sort of support by their fettered labor; fathers, husbands, brothers, men-friends

helping them to put clothes on their backs and shoes on their feet, giving them houses to dwell in, fires to warm them, and victuals to satisfy their hunger; who, were they under the protection of public opinion and the power of equal laws, and at liberty to do for themselves just what their faculties render them competent to do, would not only support themselves, but would acquire property with wonderful facility, and hold it with most remarkable tenacity. Almost all the women whom I have met, who, as society goes, are not fit to become either wives or mothers, are women who, were they free to put their powers out according to their natural bent, would show such comprehension in business affairs, and would readily acquire such aptness in managing them in detail, as to make a very great change in all the business relations now monopolized by the business men of our country. So confident am I that this view is correct, that I venture this statement for consideration and trial. Go into any school in the land, pick out ten or fifty boys; choose as many girls; select them at random, or with equal care; let them be under puberty, and put them on equal footing to the doing of anything, or of various things. Give them opportunity to be practically expert, and whatever may be the work, I am sure the girls will show as much aptness to learn, as much knowledge to apply their learning to practical use, as will the boys.

Still further than this. Take any equal number of young men and young women of the same ages, and the same scholastic advantages—because abstract knowl-

edge is a great aid to the acquirement of expertness in doing anything—put these to work where neither of the classes has had opportunities to know; it may be in any mechanic's shop, in any artist's studio, in any school of design, in any agricultural work, at any calling or in any pursuit, and it will be found that no greater number of girls than of boys, will prove incompetent. The idea—if it is to be so termed, it is hardly fit to be called such, for it is only a notion or a prejudice—that girls are less competent than boys, or women than men, to general and varied pursuits, has no basis in physiological truth. Whatever difference may exist, and I grant a wide one does exist, is owing to just such causes as have made, and always will make, intelligent and educated persons the superiors of ignorant persons. Education, however, does not consist simply in the acquisition of knowledge, but in the putting such knowledge to use as well. Who learns how a thing *ought* to be done, and yet is not taught *how to do it*, is only half-taught. The education which men have received hitherto under free institutions, has contemplated for them the accomplishment of both these kinds of knowledge. With women, up to this time, it has contemplated only the attainment of the former. To fit them for life's duties, they must not only be taught how things should be, but how things are done. Not only how they should be, and are done, but how, themselves, to do them. For this purpose they must have freedom; and freedom never was and never will be anything else than personal liberty protected by law. He who has

his liberty of person acknowledged by public opinion only, may be a free man to-day, but he may be a slave to-morrow. Only can he be a freeman, whose liberty is assured, and no assurance can come to him until the public sentiment or opinion of the people amongst whom he dwells as a citizen, is transformed into statutory authority, which they themselves cannot alter except by well recognized forms of procedure. The women of our country lack in many respects the protection of their liberty by law. They, therefore, are not free even under the most liberal construction which can be given to their position. They are enjoying liberty by sufferance; but for any appeal that they would be able to take in any show of public sentiment toward them, they are powerless. No court of justice would recognize their appeal. Does any one want an illustration to show the truth of what I assert? Let him take this, then, which is an actual case. I know an unmarried woman, who nineteen years ago left her father's house to get an education. By great economy, a good deal of self-denial, considerable hardship, and the exercise of a vast amount of sagacity—what I call genius—she succeeded. Then she sought an honest living for herself. By patient labor, and the exercise of very fine intellectual abilities directing her industries, in the lapse of years she acquired property. She is now in possession of a competence. How she shall dispose of this property is not for her to say. The law of the State in which she lives, as an abstract proposition, recognizes her citizenship, and thereupon it proceeds

to hold her responsible to the obligations and duties due from a citizen to the State. It binds her to respect the rights of others, while it refuses to respect her own rights. It holds her amenable to justice, while it commits injustice upon her. It affixes a penalty to every act of hers which traverses that line of conduct which is marked out for her guidance, while it makes void her most essential right of personality, by denying to her an equal voice with others in deciding the uses to which the results of her own industry shall be put. By her side sits a brother, who, like herself, has labored and acquired property. Every year the government comes to the man and says: "How will you be taxed? To what extent will you allow my officials to take your property for public use, giving you my protection as compensation therefor? It needs for the maintenance of its own machinery a large sum of money and many public servants. These must live. That they may live it needs money. Now, how much of your money are you willing to give, in order that the government may be efficiently represented through a class of officials who will see that its aims and purposes are fairly carried out?" The man says, "I will answer that question, where all public questions should be answered, *at the ballot box.* Give me time to consider the proposition. Let me read, converse with others, and reflect, and then I will act, and my decision shall be made known publicly when the time comes for the settlement of public questions."

To the woman, the government or the law says:

"You have earned money, the government wants it. The government proposes to take what it wants, whether you consent or not. As you have no husband, you cannot refer the question to him. As you are a woman over twenty-one years of age, it cannot be referred to your father or your brother. The government will not refer it to *you;* it, therefore, proposes to ask *itself* what it will do."

All through the years of the war this woman was taxed hard and heavy. Not a great while ago the government sent its officers to her, to peer into her property affairs, to see whether she had paid its demands to the last cent; asking no liberty of her, but coming into her presence with authority, and demanding that she surrender all evidences of property for its inspection and examination. Can any one tell what difference there is, morally, between this outrage of the government toward one of its loyal and law-abiding citizens or subjects, and that of a robber who should meet a woman at the cross-roads in the night, and say to her, "Your money or your life?" Our government says to this woman, "Your money or your liberty!"

A very eminent Irish orator once speaking for one of his countrymen, said: "Liberty is not life, but conditions of living." With such conditions of life as this woman is in, can she be said to have any assured liberty? It is absurd to assert that she has. An eminent American has said, "Give me liberty, or give me death!" This woman is in not only an abstract or philosophical sense, but in a practical sense, a slave. Suppose the

government saw fit to carry out its plan of taxing her without her consent, until it took from her all her property. Then the means of her living would be destroyed; then her locomotion, or right to go from place to place, would be substantially taken away. Then she would be helpless, for when one has been robbed of the means of livelihood already gathered up, and at the same time told that if she earns more, that, too, if the government sees fit to demand it, she must surrender peaceably, or it will take it by *force*, and at the same time imprison her, what resources has she at disposal for self-support? Not any. No despotism was able ever to exert a more powerful weapon for the destruction of individual life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, than that of robbing a subject of the material resources whereby only, can one live, be free, and happy. It matters not whether man or woman, whoever is thus treated by the government within whose precincts he or she lives, is a slave.

After my calculation one-fourth part of the womanhood of the republic belongs to the property-acquiring class. It represents independent personality—if I may say so by way of distinction—shown by large intellectual capacity, moral competence and physical fitness. It therefore demands acknowledgment in our social life, and protection at the hands of civil government. Law should come to its support, and in order to be just, should give to it the right and power to say what the nature and character of the law shall be, and what the kind and power of its application. Self-govern-

ment is God's plan of government for human beings. He intends that this should lie at the foundation of all their conditions of living. There may be persons who need to be wards of the government, or, in other words, to be under its tutelage. If there are such, let the government recognize them directly, and thus make palpable and notable distinction between them and those who are competent to take care of themselves. Whenever a person says she is competent to take care of herself, let the law stand back and give her equal chances with any other person who says he is competent to take care of himself. If she proves incompetent, the fact will show itself. Whenever it does so, and the government takes possession of her liberty, and holds it in trust for her, let it be just to her, by relieving her from an amount of responsibility for acts committed, equal to the amount of liberty of which it deprives her.

Whoever is sufficiently intelligent to understand the bearings, and meet the responsibilities of a statute in law, is equal to all that primary action which is needful to say what that statute shall be. To know how so to comprehend a law as to be able to obey it in spirit and in letter, is to be amply fitted to know how to assist in making law-makers. Whenever, therefore, government sees fit in its wisdom to deprive any person of the power of acting conjointly with others in its own organization and administration, to be just, it should relieve such person from all corresponding obligations to be taxed to meet its ordinary or extraordinary expenses; for "taxation without representation is tyranny." Obedi-

ence to law can only be predicated on duty, and this on obligation, this on rights, and these on liberty.

There is no sophistry here, but only the sternest logic. Largely, I think, the adult woman-population of our country are amply qualified to take voice and exercise primary action in the organization and management of all governmental matters which affect their own interests. It appears so foolish, ridiculous and absurd to me, to hear persons object to the enlargement of woman's sphere of action, because of her unfitness therefor, when it is obvious that like all other rational intelligencies, she is to be fitted for any duty, by having opportunity to know what the duty is, and to become expert in the doing of it, by trials at doing it. Teaching a boy to swim on dry land, is an easy feat, compared to the effort which society, the church and civil government in this country are making to create good citizens out of our American women, by depriving them entirely of all opportunity to do the duty of citizens. Citizenship, in the best contemplation of it, consists in understanding the relations which constitute it, and in the performance of the duties which those relations impose. She can never have very much interest in the administration of a government, who has nothing to say as to the nature of its organization or the manner of its administration. Since woman has faculties of perception and reflection, is capable of training, education and development, she can only be responsible to herself, to society, to mankind and to God, for doing well what she has had *liberty* to learn how to do.

As many women in this country have but little liberty, they, therefore, can be responsible only in a very narrow sphere for doing well what they do. Many of them are shut up to so narrow limits of action, as to have their time hang heavy on their hands. As they cannot spend it profitably in the consideration of great interests, because in the management of these they have nothing to do, they seek relief from their pent-up sensibilities by turning their attention to little things. These, they come to be familiar with, and in a measure interest themselves in them. Group a number of them together of an afternoon, and they talk of "sleeves, bonnets, caps, bills registered and expectations sure." Usually, they spoil their practical life, because society, the church, and civil government have despoiled their abstract life. Whoever is to be practically good for anything, must, as a condition precedent, possess an abstract right to liberty; and liberty consists in the use of all one's powers and faculties, undisturbed by anybody, so long as in their use such person disturbs nobody. Such liberty I claim for my countrywomen, one and all, who are not lacking in natural capacity nor ability to take care of themselves, and will make good and useful citizens so soon as they obtain the consent of society and of the church, and the protection of civil government. If society and the church become stupidly and obstinately recusant in the matter, then all the more do they need the assistance of government. This assistance I do not ask to be rendered in the shape of special privileges, or immunities granted to them. I

solicit no monopolies in their favor, but simply and earnestly urge that under the constitution of their country and of the States wherein they live, they *be authorized by law* to exercise the same franchises and enjoy the same legal privileges and immunities that men do. This is all they should ask; with this they should be content; with nothing else, in my opinion, should they be. True Democracy demands this. True Republicanism clamors for it.

It is high time the political parties in our country representing Democracy and Republicanism, should be willing to put away injustice, and enthrone justice in her stead.

CHAPTER XIV.

THEIR BUSINESS CAPACITIES.

I HAVE said that the women in our country composing a class not fit, as society goes, to become either wives or mothers, have as large natural capacities for varied business pursuits, and as comprehensive powers to understand and succeed in such pursuits, as any equal number of business men of our country.

This statement I believe to be literally true. My reason for believing it is, that just to the degree that these women have opportunities furnished to show their abilities, they prove to be possessors of them. I could count not less than a hundred women, pursuing the avocations of business men, with just as much success as men obtain who follow them. This, as far as it goes, substantiates my statement. But every day brings additional proof of the truth of my view in the person of some woman who has broken ground in a new field of labor, and is rapidly winning success therein.

We now have women-doctors, women-editors, women short-hand reporters, correspondents of newspapers, druggists, dry-goods merchants, lawyers, printers, telegraph operators, cashiers in business firms, book-keepers, teachers in academies, and professors in colleges, teach

ers of horticulture, editors and reporters of the cattle-stock markets for public journals, brokers and stock operators in the exchange market, breeders of fancy fowls, keepers of bees, milliners, mantua-makers, clerks in hardware stores, justices of the peace, grand jurors, engrossing clerks in legislatures, theatrical actors, public dancers, lecturers before lyceums, ordained preachers of the gospel and settled pastors over churches, eloquent orators, pomologists, botanists, teachers of elocution, painters, sculptors, architects, and successful operators in various other avocations and pursuits, not needful to mention here. In looking up the histories of these business women, I have, as yet, found not one who has failed, sooner or later, to win prosperity and reputation. I account for their uniform success, because of their natural giftedness for management of business affairs in detail. Without exception almost, have the women with whose business relations I have become familiar, shown aptness of observation, and quickness of power of reflection, and of comprehending all that was needful to know in order to prosper in their professions or pursuits.

With men, failures in business often arise from want of power to connect the various departments of their business, so as to make each sustain all the others, and thus aggregate and increase the sum total of effort which they put forth. If a close observer fixes his attention on the movements of any kind of business man who seems outwardly to be doing well, but really is struggling hard to keep from failure, he will find that

between the various departments of his business there are links wanting; so that, while in some of them he succeeds, the benefits of such success are not reflected upon the other departments; and for want of this reflection the whole business goes down. If a merchant in any department of trade, it may be that he buys goods carefully and sells them profitably, but he does not get his pay; or he buys carefully and gets his pay for what he sells, but is a poor salesman; or if he buys raw material, purchasing it economically, he manufactures it expensively and sells it for little profit and on credit, and so loses quite a percentage, and makes nothing. There is a want of capacity for business in some direction almost always existing, and, if closely looked after, to be found with men who fail in business pursuits.

With women of this class this is much less likely to be a prominent fact. Very few of them fail in what they undertake, if they are left so untrammelled that they can act freely. Large caution belongs to them. A disposition to understand minutely whatever they undertake to do, is a peculiar quality of theirs. They therefore have less proclivities to run risks or make ventures than men have, and are safer in the way of developing power.

Almost all men who have been large operators in any business pursuits, and who have had good wives to whom they have made known their business operations, will testify to the benefits received, not infrequently, from the counsels which their wives have given them,

urging them to do or to abstain from doing certain things, because in the one or in the other case, was success or failure. I cannot now think of any single element that could be thrown into the business operations of our country, that would be likely, or sure, to have a more salutary effect, than to have a large number of women educated to fill various pursuits, and let them act with the same freedom and want of constraint in their business relations that men do. In this way an infusion of fresh force would be added, quite vigorous from its intellectual, and even more so from its moral point of view. It may not be to the credit of human nature as represented by man, to say that the moralities of business would be enhanced, broadened, deepened, and heightened by having women educated to business, and made to take their proper places in its various departments. There can be little doubt, however, that such would be the result. Several reasons might be offered going to show the probable correctness of this view. But one only will I mention, which is, that monopolists always become unconscionable as they are released from the influence of competition, and are permitted to hold their positions without dispute.

Their reason and their moral sense become inactive, and they are less disposed to take into consideration the right or the wrong of what they are doing, than they would be were they subject to the watchfulness and the criticism of others who would thrive upon their mistakes or their lapses from integrity, were they to make them. It has always been a sad failing in the

life of the American people, republican or democratic, as it is, whether civil, religious or political, to place the entire business interests of the whole people in the exclusive charge of the men of the republic. This I am sure would never have been the case, had we had no system of servitude in the land. Now that is abolished and democracy is *free*, the truth can have a chance to flourish. The business arrangements of society will have to undergo organic modification. There will have to be a reconstruction of the whole social fabric, beginning with the family, extending into business concerns, affecting the church, and culminating in change of governmental management. This alteration will take place by means of the active development of the inherent force of the womanhood of the country, and its infusion into all the departments of society and government. It is not needful to have very large foresight to understand what must be the effects of causes which are all the while at work under the direction of Liberty. Living as all the people of the United States now do under institutions whose legitimate influence enlarges personality, gives scope to individual action, and constantly tends to make each and all equal before the law, it appears to me that whatever existing relations, whether household, generally social, political or religious, are so conservative as to be antagonistic or actively opposed to the pursuit by woman of any calling or business which man honorably follows, will have to give way to the genius which originally inspired our fathers to organize our republic, and which has since so

wonderfully preserved and prospered us as a people. Why should it not be so? If woman has a soul of her own, and is therefore a person, necessarily she must have attaching to, or rather inhering in her, the *rights* of person. Amongst these rights are those "of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." To secure these rights to her, that is, for her good, as well as for the general good, and not for the general good as against her good, is government instituted in this country. Its appropriate and particular function is to secure to her and maintain for her (as for any and every person) her right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of her own happiness. That she may be thus protected and made free, all constitutional inhibitions, or legislative enactments, or social customs, or any kind of etiquette, or relations to any church of which she may be a member, or conditions of living in any family of which she may be a constituent, must give way, wherever they operate so as to constrain her freedom. If they forbid her to pursue her happiness, to maintain her liberty, to insure her life, they must be modified; because life is an inalienable right, and liberty is its own offspring; and out of the union of life and liberty is produced the right to pursue her own happiness in her own way, without constraint, without hindrance, without detriment, without intervention from any body or bodies of persons, so long as she accords to others the respect, and maintains for others the same rights which she claims for herself. It is not a difficult thing to arrange family relations, and relations of ordinary society, and rela-

tions in the church organization, and relations of the body politic, so that each individual member of any of these communities or corporations shall have all that belongs naturally to him or to her. There is no sort of necessity for giving up rights, in some directions, that rights in other directions may be secured. What a man or a woman cannot do, without committing a wrong in the doing of it, neither of them ever had or can have a *right* to do. Society in the United States is not founded upon the basis of giving up some of one's natural rights, in order that the rest may be protected. This is the perverse form of statement of those old sophists who held that society was a compact, that government was the outgrowth of an agreement between the several individuals making it up. A better philosophy is, that society is a necessity of human nature, and government is the natural result of the demands of human nature, and of the aggregate necessities of mankind; that therefore, in the organization and administration of society and government, there is no giving up of what belongs to the individual. There is only the mutual acknowledgment, on the part of all, of the rights of each, and a recognition of an obligation on the part of all to protect each in what legitimately belongs to him. When society shall come to recognize the personality of woman, and seek to protect her in its assertion, and in the maintenance of her liberty, legislation, whether constitutional or statutory, will take its proper place.

Until that time we are to have conflicts and strug-

gles. Divisions and dissensions in families and in neighborhoods, in churches and in political parties and in governmental organizations, will exist; and it is well that they should; for the Master of all government came into this world not to send peace, but a sword, until government be established on no other basis than that of absolute righteousness. God never builds on quicksand. He lays his fabric always on a rock, even so that when the rains descend, and the winds blow, and storms beat upon what he builds, it stands. It is the nature of truth to stand; it is the nature of error to topple down and fall headlong, and burst its own bowels, and die foolishly and everlastingly.

In this country, by the blessing of Divine Providence, the organizers of our government and moulders of its political fabric, and shapers and fashioners of its religious institutions, and managers of its social establishment, struck absolute truth at the very outset, and let it gush up to the surface as Moses' rod let out the waters from their hollow in the rock. They made a declaration which can never be improved upon, as an utterance of organic truth: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, amongst which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness: that to secure these rights, governments are instituted amongst men, deriving their right to govern, from the *just* consent of the governed." Is there a man or a woman in all this republic, uncursed by selfishness, unprejudiced in mind, and clear in spiritual perception,

who in candor will say, that it is his or her belief that the individuals who signed that declaration, and pledged to its maintenance "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor," intended to convey the idea that the rights therein mentioned belong only to human beings of the masculine gender? Out of the promptings of an honest heart, or the upswellings of inspiration, or the deductions of reason candidly applied, it seems to me no man will make such a statement. On the other hand, every honest, untainted, uncorrupted person will admit that by the term *men*, the signers meant persons of the *feminine*, as truly as of the masculine gender. If this be so, there is no escape for our people from the application of these principles to the womanhood, as truly as to the manhood of the country, except in and through the most outrageous and wicked apostasy. The history of our country does not favor the conclusion that such will be the ultimate shape which this republic, under the suggestions of liberty, will take. During the time that we have existed as a government, every conflict into which, as a people, we have entered, at the behests or dictation of Freedom, has ended in our becoming more liberal. There has been no step backward from the day the nation was born to the present hour. Steadily we have gone into, and have come out of struggles that tried our patience, our pecuniary resources, our virtue, our courage, our competency to conquer; and from every one which has been noteworthy, we have emerged in better conditions of sentiment and intellectual toleration of practical liberty than existed

when the conflict opened. This being the historic fact, who needs to have the gift of prophesy to enable him to draw just conclusions in respect to the result of the efforts now being put forth to give to the women of this country the acknowledged right to a voice in the government, and in the management of all affairs and legitimate interests which they hold in common with the men of the republic? The more the question is discussed, the better will woman's conditions be. When discussion has produced knowledge, and knowledge has induced reflection, then will come right action, and woman will be free. Once free, the next thing to be done will be to protect her in her freedom, and for this purpose she must have the ballot. That is the sword whereby, under Liberty, she alone can conquer, and it is clearly within her "appropriate sphere" to claim the use of such a magnificent moral weapon.

CHAPTER XV.

THE BALLOT.

In the United States the ballot is the highest possible representative of power that any human being can have. It is symbol, badge, emblem, and type, at one and the same time. It declares personality, pronounces liberty, asserts individuality, maintains equality, and protects property. No other instruments or agents compare with it, or rank it, for all these it absorbs into itself. Considered in the light of the philosophy of free institutions, it is bread to the hungry, clothes to the naked, shelter to the homeless. It is reputation, position, power. It is law, society, and government. It is all these, because with it and through it, and by it, all these are possible, and without it not one of them is sure.

If the distinctive feature of humanity is personality, represented by appropriate exterior organization and outward surroundings of life, then it is clear that its maintenance is of the highest importance to all creatures possessing it. Individually, each person has the deepest interest in preserving in full measure of action all those constituents which go to make up his personality, whatever these may be. As these elements or attributes of his

own are exactly the same in kind and quality as are those of each and every other human being, his right to them is just as good, and no better, than is the right of any other or every other person to his own. It follows, therefore, that he can have no sound interest in depriving any other person of having the full measure of personality belonging to him accorded, because to invade or weaken or destroy such person's right thereto would be seriously to invade and aid in the destruction of his own; since it cannot possibly happen that, of two persons holding an equal and common right to a thing, one can injure his fellow's right without injuring his own.

The most important thing, then, for a human being to do, or to have done for him, is to obtain a public recognition of his personality; by which I mean a recognition of those qualities or faculties, attributes or powers, which he holds distinctively from all living organisms dwelling on the earth. Whatever these may be, taken together, he is to have them publicly recognized as his own, to be put to service for his benefit, and not to be claimed by any other person as rightfully to be put to use for such other person's benefit to any degree, or in any manner differently from that which such person is bound to reciprocate. The obligation is equal and mutual, or does not exist at all. Count these attributes what you please; say they are reason, conscience, will. Thus, in order to be a *person* in contradistinction from a *thing*, a living being must have in him faculties which, when drawn out and properly put to use, will enable him, (1,) to think; (2,) to think rightly; (3,) to act

in view of his right thought. Say these are needful, amongst other qualities, to make a person; then the first and most important thing, I repeat, to be done, is to get a public recognition of them. How is this to be done in *this* country? Once done, the feet of the person on whose behalf it is done, touch solid ground. Till done he treads on quaking bog, "beneath whose skim of earth dread ruin lies." It is to be done by the adoption of any rules which are most convenient, whereby the consent of all is pledged to the recognition and protection of each, because each one thus pledged is equal, and only equal in power and right to pledge, to any other one. Under our form of government the pledge is a written constitution or fundamental law, of which the ballot is the public exponent. Whoever, therefore, has such pledge without its corresponding factor, the ballot, has imperfect security in behalf of his personality, unless he is at the same time freed from all responsibility to others for the exercise of his personality. For, if he have no voice in determining what his obligations to others shall be, others should have no voice in determining what his duties to them shall be. To deprive one by organic or constitutional law of the right to protect himself, demands that, by the same law, he be relieved of all duty to protect others. In other words, to say that a person shall have no voice in making the laws, justly draws in the correlative statement that he is to have no duties in obeying the laws. For it is morally certain that whoever knows enough to obey a law, knows enough to have an elementary power in the making of it.

As rights of person and property in this country can only be secure under the protection of law, so law can only be said to be fairly just when those in whom both of these classes of rights inhere, have a voice in determining what the nature and character of the laws shall be. And as rights of person and property absorb into themselves all other rights, so a sure protection and defense of these become safe-guards to all others. Take care of one's personal rights, and property rights spring up immediately; take care of both, and all his relative rights are looked after. The only way, then, to take care of them all, is to legislate and enforce the laws in behalf of the rights of person; and the only way to legislate rightly with reference thereto is for the person to have a voice in choosing the legislators. Said I not rightly, then, when I said that the ballot is the most comprehensive representative power known to the American people? Its moral significance is in proportion to the worth of the interests it represents, and the value of these interests is to be measured by the intrinsic worth of human nature. What this is worth let each individual decide for himself. I am not afraid of his underrating it while his estimate of it is confined to himself. It is only when a person undertakes to settle a matter of this kind for another, that his moral sense passes under a cloud. Put the question to an individual man, What is personal liberty worth to *you?* and he will not underestimate it. I used to say twenty years ago, when advocating the anti-slavery cause, that I could change any man's views of the pro-

slavery character of the Declaration of Independence by placing *him* under its ban. Only construe it so as to make *him* one of the proscribed class to whom the benefit of its great doctrine of liberty should not apply, and he would reject it or your construction of it instantly. The ballot is to such person of high regard. It is his talisman, his charm with which he keeps off devilish transformations. Taken from him by force or guile, or lost to him by public indifference, and, in his view, his manhood would not survive the casualty a day. The thought of disfranchisement makes his flesh crawl. Going through a graveyard at twelve o'clock at night is nothing to it. What! have his rights, his privileges and immunities, his personal liberty, his social security, his property, his protection of his family, his right to worship God, to follow what pursuit he may choose—one, all, placed at the disposition of his fellows without his having an acknowledged, and recognized and well-guarded right to express an ultimate decision for or against such disposition? Call you this freedom? The dullest clod of a man to be found would know that to place him thus would be to do to him the unfair thing, and his stupid soul would rebel and keep rebelling against the outrage. Only a Thing could take this cooly and with satisfaction. God in man always gives manly utterance when he speaks at all, and hence the human instincts are made always to tend *upward*. The human spirit loves liberty, longs for her; and as liberty always soars, so the soul of man aspires.

Whence, then, come the terrible degradations we see? How do they get birth and rearing? Sad enough is the story, humiliating enough is the solution. They come by persons denying to others what they claim for themselves. Out of such selfishness nothing but degradation, both to wrong-doer and to wronged, can come. For men to prate of the value of liberty, and while securing it to themselves deny it to woman; to talk with pompous enthusiasm of the moral significance of the ballot and its essential importance in the maintenance of free government, whilst all the women in the republic are disfranchised, is to mount hypocrisy on stilts as if one were stalking deer over moorlands. The ballot is worthy of men's regard, because they are *persons*, and not from any quality of *gender*, which, by the way, they hold in common with brutes. The ballot is a moral power pre-eminently, representing moral nature, moral consciousness, moral responsibility, the force of mind and indestructible rights. It floats by its specific gravity in an atmosphere into which qualities of gender cannot come. God does not legislate downward for man, but always upward. The lower and the lesser He designs should give way to the higher and the nobler. Sex is a specific quality, having precise sphere and prescribed limits; important, significant and valuable in its orbit, which is narrow and easily defined. But the moral nature of man, the earth is its developing place, the universe the sphere of its action. To look after, promote, protect, progress; to strengthen, to culture, refine and make beautiful the moral man,

which, in the contemplation of the Creator, knows no gender, is the grand mission of the ballot. It symbolizes labor and types out schools. It emblematizes liberty and shadows forth the law. It gathers these together and denominates them power, and it makes this bow its knees in the presence of the Human.

Now, whether woman in this country should have the ballot depends on two things.

1. Whether she is a person.

2. If she is, whether she possesses such a degree of natural capacity as when fairly developed by education under free institutions, will render her fit and equal to take care of herself.

That she is a person I shall assume to be true, because to me it is self-evident; and I am not disposed to seek to demonstrate that which, being self-evident, lies beyond the reach of argumentative demonstration. It would be a poor task that I should set myself, were I to undertake it.

If man is a person, most certainly woman is. The qualities of personality which belong to him, belong also to her. They rest in her intellectual and moral constitution, as truly as in his. The difference in their physical organizations can have no effect whatever in modifying, qualifying, or organically affecting them.

It will have to be admitted by and by that women are as well qualified to use the ballot as men are, when it is understood that its use has as much to do with looking after, protecting, caring for, improving and ele-

vating the conditions of domestic life, as it has with other conditions of life common to our people.

Our theory of government is based upon the view that society precedes government, and the family precedes general society. If this be a correct view, the foundation, or bottom principle of government in this country, is the organization and maintenance of the family institution. To look after foundation rights, is quite as necessary and important a duty as falls to the lot of careful, cautious, and foresighted persons. Domestic life in this country needs its safeguards, and these need to be protected by legislation. Who in reality is the directing, controlling, managing spirit of any well-ordered family? Is it not the woman rather than the man? Abstractly, he may be considered the head of the family, and the law may so regard him, and the religious etiquette of the age or the community in which he lives, may so denominate him; but the moving spirit, the controlling soul of the family organization, is woman. Of all high and important interests, at present demanding careful consideration, just dealing, and liberal legislation, none can more fairly claim public attention than the household interests of the people of our country. In determining what shall be the relations of wife to husband, of mother to children, of woman to property, of woman as a person to personality and liberty, in settling what shall be her social status, why should she have no political action? Can there be any reason for it? Besides, taking in that class of women in our country whose interests I

have discussed, who are not wives, nor mothers, nor, as society goes, I say, are fitted to become such, yet who nevertheless are active, energetic, comprehensive, large-minded, far-sighted, resolute women; who know how to reason abstractly yet profoundly, and apply their reason to practical things expertly and with great sagacity, shrewdness and success; who, therefore, are naturally competent for business, and, under free institutions and the advancing spirit of toleration, are already acquiring property, and in the future are to be much more successful in its acquisition, why should they not have the ballot? If human personality is good for anything, they should have it, for they are persons. If liberty to the human being be worth while, they should have it, for they are human. If property is worth protection, they should have it, for they hold property. If the well-being of society needs protection, they should have it, for they are members of society. If the family organization needs to be cared for and insured, they should have the ballot as a weapon of defence, for they are members of families. If business occupations and interests are to be looked after and sheltered, they should have the ballot, for they do business. If the rights of minors are to be considered and made sure, they should have the ballot, for they are often wives and mothers, though, as society goes, I think they ought not to be.

In God's name, in man's name, in the name of liberty, justice, truth and right, I call for the ballot for woman. Given to her, it will do much to save her from the friv-

olities, falsities and fallacies, which now everywhere attend her walk in life. It will open up new avenues of thought for her, develop genius, work up to the surface hidden power, reconstruct and reconstitutionalize her, and make for her, along with her men fellow-citizens, a "new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." Give the ballot to the women of our country, and our Republic will live and thrive gloriously.

THE END.

THE LAWS OF LIFE

AND

Woman's Health Journal

Is an original paper, published monthly, in quarto form of sixteen pages, on fine paper, with tinted covers.

Edited by MISS HARRIET N. AUSTIN, M. D.,

ASSISTED BY

JAMES C. JACKSON, M. D., *Physician-in-Chief of our Home,*

And an able Corps of Assistants and Contributors.

The Journal treats of all subjects relating to Life and Health, and embodies the experience of twenty years' practice by its editors, at the head of the Largest Hygienic Institution in America.

The aim of this Journal is to advocate and commend to the people improved ways of living by which individual, family and general social life may be made to put on more beneficial, satisfactory and beautiful forms than at present prevail. It teaches how to live healthfully and to make health the basis for the growth and development of symmetrical character. Some of the leading topics are:

Care of the Sick Room,
Nursing the Sick,
Food and Baths for the Sick,
Care of Children,
Dress of Children,
Flower Gardening,
Fruit Growing,
Dress,
Sleep,
Ventilation,
Answers to Questions from Correspondents,
Letters,
Special Diseases and their Treatment without Medicine,
Continued Stories,
The best kinds of Food and how to Prepare Them,
Lectures on General Principles,
Running accounts of Life on the Hillside,
Building of Houses.
Furnishing of Houses,
Natural History,
Woman's Rights and Responsibilities, etc.

Each number of the Laws of Life for 1870, will contain a lecture from Dr. James C. Jackson on the

TRAINING OF CHILDREN.

Also a Chapter from the same writer of "Incidents and Reminiscences in My Life," of which one of our public Journals says: These are very interesting to those who care to learn how our great Reformers are made.

Terms—One dollar per year in advance. Most liberal and valuable Premiums given to agents for clubs.

Specimen Copies sent free on receipt of stamp to pay postage.

Send for a copy, and circular of our Health Publications.

Address, **AUSTIN, JACKSON & CO.,**
Dansville, Livingston Co., N. Y.

How to Treat the Sick

WITHOUT MEDICINE.

A NEW WORK,

By James C. Jackson, M. D.,

Author of "Consumption: How to Prevent it and How to Cure it," "The Sexual Organism, and its Healthful Management," and numerous popular Health Tracts. Also Physician-in-Chief of "Our Home on the Hillside," at Dansville, Livingston Co., N. Y., the largest Hygienic Water Cure in the World.

The book contains 520 pages and has a fine likeness of the Author and a beautiful and correct engraving of the Institution over which he presides; is nicely printed and bound in first-class style.

CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.—My Method of Treating Disease.
II.—What is Disease?
III.—The True Materia Medica.
IV.—Air.
V.—Food.
VI.—Water.
VII.—Time for Taking Baths.
VIII.—Sunlight.
IX.—Dress.
X.—Exercise.
XI.—Sleep and its Recuperations.
XII.—The Sick Chamber and its Surroundings.
XIII.—Children and their Diseases.
XIV.—Teething, Teething Diarrhœa, Summer Complaint.
XV.—Tetter, Eruptions, Scald Head, Common Itch.
XVI.—Measles.
XVII.—Croup.
XVIII.—Diphtheria.
XIX.—Scarlet Fever, Whooping Cough.
XX.—Summer Complaint, Dysentery.
XXI.—Diseases of Grown Persons, Baldness, Deafness, Blindness, Inflammation of the Eyes.
XXII.—Nasal Catarrh, Nose-Bleed.
XXIII.—Apoplexy, Inflammation of the Brain, Hydrocephalus, or Dropsy of the Brain.
XXIV.—Paralysis.
XXV.—Epilepsy.
XXVI.—Insanity.
XXVII.—Drunkenness.
XXVIII.—Hysteria.
XXIX.—St. Vitus' Dance.
XXX.—Pulmonary Consumption Mumps, Salivation.
XXXI.—Quinsy, Bronchitis, Inflammation of the Lungs.
XXXII.—Pleurisy, Spitting of Blood or Hemorrahge of the Lungs.
XXIII.—The Heart and its Diseases.
XXXIV.—Dyspepsia.
XXXV.—Colic.
XXXVI.—Cancerous Conditions of the Stomach.
XXXVII.—Diseases of the Spleen.
XXXVIII.—Diseases of the Liver.
XXXIX.—Calculi, Jaundice.
XL.—Diseases of the Intestines, Duodenitis Bowel Colic.
XLI.—Inflammation of the Bowels, Peritonitis.
XLII.—Dropsy of the Peritoneum.
XLIII.—Lead Colic.
XLIV.—Inflammation of the Mesenteric Glands.
XLV. Diseases of the Kidneys, Congestion, Inflammation. Diabetes, Gravel.
XLVI.—Bright's Diseases of the Kidneys. Urinary Disease.
XLVII.—Neuralgia of the Bladder, Paralysis of the Bladder, Inflammation of the Coats of the Bladder.
XLVIII.—Worms.
XLIX.—Piles.
L.—Sexual Organs.
LI.—Rheumatism.
LII.—Remittent Fever, or Fever and Ague.
LIII.—Intermittent Fever, Congestive Chills
LIV.—Typhus and Typhoid Fevers.
LV.—Erysipelas, or St. Anthony's Fire, Purpura Hemorrhagica, Acne.
LVI.—Ulcers, Boils, and Carbuncles.
LVII.—Burns and Scalds, Goitre.
LVIII.—Varicose Veins.
LIX.—Baths, and How to Take them.

We wish to engage agents, all over the country, to sell this work. Here is a new field for Book Agents, and one into which they may enter with good prospect of abundant success. We give liberal terms. Price, $2.25 by mail, postage paid.

Address, AUSTIN, JACKSON & CO.,
"OUR HOME," Dansville, Livingston Co., N. Y.

Our Home on the Hillside,

DANSVILLE, LIVINGSTON CO., N. Y.

THIS Institution is the largest Hygienic Water-Cure at present existing in the world. It is presided over by, and is under the medical management of, Dr. James C. Jackson, who is the discoverer of the Psycho-Hygienic method of treating the sick, and under the application of which he has treated nearly 20,000 persons in the last twenty years, with most eminent success, and *without ever giving any of them any medicine.*

The Psycho-hygienic philosophy of treating the sick, no matter what their age, sex, or disease, consists in the use of those means only as remedial agencies whose ordinary or legitimate effect on the human living body when taken into or applied to it is to *preserve* its health. The fallacy of giving poisonous medicines to Invalids has been abundantly shown in "Our Home" in the results of our treatment.

Our Institution is large enough to accommodate 250 guests, is, after the plan adopted by us, complete in all its appointments, having worthy and intelligent helpers in all its departments of labor, and who give their proportion of sympathy and influence to the creation and maintenance of a sentiment and opinion cheering to the invalid, and, therefore, decidedly therapeutic in its effects. The scenery about the Establishment is very beautiful, the air is dry and very salubrious, we have plenty of sunshine, and pure soft living water in great abundance. Besides all these, and which *we* prize as one of the highest privileges and health-giving opportunities our guests could possibly have, we live ourselves, and so can enable them to live, free from Fashion and her expensive and ruinous ways. Life with us is simple, not sybaritic, is true, not hollow and false, and so of itself tends to its own perpetuation, and, of course, to health. A great many of our guests who have for years been great sufferers, growing steadily more and more sickly, begin to get well, and go on getting well in such silent yet sure, in such imperceptible yet certain ways, as never to be conscious how it was brought about. The means used seem so utterly incommensurate to the results produced, that it seems marvelous. So true is it that in Nature

"God's mightiest things
Are His simplest things,"

and that to understand *how* things are done, one needs to cultivate a teachable spirit, and to cherish a reverence for Law. To teach those who come to us for treatment what the laws of life are, and to awaken in them the desire to obey these laws, is to establish a most favorable condition-precedent to their recovery. Sick ones, whoever you are, or wherever you are, do you want to get well? and to learn how to keep your health, having got well? Come to "Our Home" if you can, and once here learn the all-important lesson, that

"Nature as a mistress is gentle and holy,
And to obey her is to live."

Circulars of the Institution or any information in regard to it may be obtained by addressing either James C. Jackson, M.D., Miss Harriet N. Austin, M.D., or Dr. James H. Jackson. These Physicians may also be consulted by letter by the sick who are unable to attend the establishment. Fee for home prescription $5.

AUSTIN, JACKSON & CO.,
Proprietors.

HARRIET N. AUSTIN,
JAMES H. JACKSON,
LUCRETIA E. JACKSON.

THE SEXUAL ORGANISM,

AND ITS HEALTHFUL MANAGEMENT.

BY JAMES C. JACKSON, M.D.

PRICE BY MAIL, - TWO DOLLARS.

This is one of the most valuable books ever written. It should be read by every married man and woman in the land. Every clergyman who takes an interest in the health and happiness and present as well as future well-being of his fellow-creatures, should read it. He may rest assured he will preach better sermons for having read it. Every young man contemplating marriage should read it. Every school-boy should carefully and studiously read it. Every young woman should read it. She will find in it nothing offensive to modesty, nothing that should make her blush, but much that will instruct her how to protect her rights and personal immunities so as forever to secure her from having cause to blush.

This Book is by far the ablest ever written on the subject. It embodies the experience of one of the ablest physicians living, and whose opportunities for thinking and studying the Laws of the Human Organism in this *special* department have in our judgment never been equalled, certainly never excelled. If the tens of thousands of young men in our land suffering from debilities arising from their want of knowledge of the Laws of the Sexual System, could each have a volume of this work placed in his hands, what a blessing it would be to him.

The Publishers are not unmindful that on the subject of Sex, the people of the United States hold a conservative position. The Publishers are happy to be able to say, that *they* hold the same position. Neither "for love nor money" could they be induced to publish anything that might serve to weaken in the minds of the people—especially the rising generation—the regard which they cherish and are taught to cherish for the Social and Family relations. This book contains no subtle sophistries, no cunningly concocted falsehoods made to look like truths, which once read shall seem to poison the mind and debase the moral sense of him or her who reads it. It sets no snares, and digs no pitfalls for the young and the unwary.

The Author is a Christian gentleman, a philanthropist and a man of science, who, having won by his great talents and very large professional practice, an eminent position as a Physician, has turned his great knowledge to account, in writing on a *special* theme, and it is no small meed of praise to him that we can say, out of the ten thousand volumes of the work already sold in the United States, neither from press nor private individual has there ever come to our knowledge an unfavorable criticism.

Buy the book, then, and read it. Having read it yourself lend it to your neighbor. You can do nothing better with the same amount of money. The violation of the Laws of Life in the department of the Sexual Structure is very great and knowledge *should* be had. Read, digest, do, and live.

Address,

AUSTIN, JACKSON & CO.,

Dansville, Livingston Co., N. Y.

Are You of Consumptive Family?

If so, do you wish to know ow to *avoid* having Consumption yourself, or if you have already got it in its first or second stages, how to cure it? Then send to Austin, Jackson & Co., and purchase Dr. Jackson's Book, entitled:

Consumption: How to Treat It, and How to Prevent It.

In this book you will find the information you need. Dr. Jackson is the only physician who, having treated this disease successfully without the use of Drugs and Medicines, has placed his ideas at the service of unprofessional readers. The Book is written in a clear style, is free from technical terms, and full of valuable instruction. Thousands of volumes of it are in circulation, and tens of thousands of human lives have been saved by reading it and following its instructions.

The work has two very valuable points:

1st. It elaborates and makes plain the methods and ways of overcoming hereditary tendencies and constitutional predispositions to the development of the disease, so that those who have them may escape, and, if children, may overcome them, and grow up robust and live to good Old Age.

The instruction on this point contained in the Book is great, and ought to be in possession and use by every father and mother who have Scrofulous children. Consumption in the United States and in Canada, is almost always induced under bad conditions of living operating on persons of Scrofulous constitutions. Where this is the case it is a pity that those who get it and die from it, could not know how to stop its development. "An ounce of Prevention is worth a pound of Cure," and that the advice of Dr. Jackson is ample to produce this result, the testimony of thousands of persons proves beyond cavil.

2nd. The Book tells the reader not only how to understand the Consumptive constitution, and how to avoid and overcome its active development, but it instructs the reader how to treat curatively those persons who are curable, without the use of drugs and medicines and poisonous nostrums. This is of itself most valuable information. Reader, have you ever thought what a drug-poisoned people we of the United States are? everybody, almost, taking when sick, stuff to cure them which, were they well, would surely make them sick. So blind are the People, and so deadened their instincts, that from the child of a span long to the man of mature age, *dosing* with poisons is the remedy for every human ailment. So common is this practice and so destructive to life is it, that the wisest observers do not hesitate to say that War, Pestilence and Famine, have not killed as many persons since the Creation of Man as Drug-medication has. Of all the diseases to which the Human Organism is subject, none have proved so *incurable* under Drug-medication as Pulmonary Consumption, while of them all none has proved more curable under Psycho-hygienic treatment than it.

Now, as there are in the United States thousands and tens of thousands of Consumptive persons who are curable, and tens and hundreds of thousands who, though not having Consumption as yet, are sure to have it under the ordinary course of things, we take pleasure in telling them that they can be intelligently instructed how to get well, or how to keep from having the disease. The Book is nearly 400 pages octavo, has been extensively noticed by the Press and always with favor, and is so ably written that one of the most scientific men in our country has said that "Were the Author never to write more, this book of itself in less than fifty years will place his name high in the temple of Fame, as one of the farthest-seeing men of his day and as a benefactor to mankind." Address, AUSTIN, JACKSON & CO., DANSVILLE, LIVINGSTON CO., N. Y., who will send the work, post-paid, for $2 50.

HEALTH TRACTS,

PUBLISHED BY

AUSTIN, JACKSON & CO.,

Dansville, Livingston Co., N. Y.

	Singly.	Per doz.
1. How to Rear Beautiful Children,	8 cents.	60
2. How to Cure Drunkards,	8 cents.	60
3. How to take Baths,	8 cents.	60
4. Tobacco, and its Effects upon the Health and Character of those who use it,	15 cents.	1 50
5. Diphtheria; its Causes, Treatment and Cure,	8 cents.	60
6. The American Costume, or Woman's Right to Good Health,	8 cents.	60
7. Flesh as Food; or How to Live without Meat,	8 cents.	60
8. Dyspepsia; or How to have a Sound Stomach,	8 cents.	60
9. Student Life; or How to Work the Brain without Over-Working the Body,	8 cents.	60
10. The Curse-Lifted; or Maternity Made Easy,	8 cents.	60
11. Piles and their Treatment,	8 cents.	60
12. The Gluttony Plague,	8 cents.	60
13. Wife Killing,	8 cents.	60
14. Shall our Girls Live or Die?	8 cents.	60
15. How to Nurse the Sick.	8 cents.	60
16. How to Get Well and How to Keep Well,	8 cents.	60
17. The Four Drunkards,	6 cents.	45
18. Dancing; its Evils and its Benefits,	10 cents.	75
19. The Weak Backs of American Women,	8 cents.	60
20. Clergymen; What they Owe to Themselves, to their Wives and to Society,	8 cents.	60
21. Papers on Alcohol,	8 cents.	60

Sets containing one of each, $1.30.

These will be sent prepaid by mail to any address in the United States upon receipt of the above prices.